

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXV, 2.

WHOLE No. 98.

I.—THE PERIPATETIC MEAN OF STYLE AND THE THREE STYLISTIC CHARACTERS.

Concerning the origin of the ancient division of style into three types or characters, there seems to be at the present time general unanimity in attributing it to Theophrastus. It was first assigned to him, so far as I am aware, by Westermann,¹ but the more recent discussions of the matter award to Dr. H. Rabe² (of Hannover) the credit of having demonstrated the origin of the classification and its place in Theophrastus' rhetorical system.³ In criticising this conclusion I am less concerned to attack the name of Theophrastus than I am to correct a misconception of the stylistic theory of the Peripatetic school which follows upon the acceptance of the evidence which has yielded this result. For in fact a *true* account of the origin of the three styles will attribute to Theophrastus the formulation of the ideas which gave rise at a subsequent time to this division, but it will approach the matter from a wholly different point of view, and will employ other evidence than that which has hitherto been used. It is therefore to define some aspects of the Peripatetic conception of rhetorical style, as formulated by the two first masters of the school, that

¹ Griech. Beredsamkeit I, p. 170 and n. 8. But see Vossius Com. Rhet. II (1630), p. 464. Cf. Blass, Griech. Beredsamkeit von Alex. bis Aug., p. 81, and Jebb, Attic Orators, Vol. II, p. 397.

² De Theophrasti libris *περί λέξεως*, Diss. Bonn, 1890.

³ Cf. Norden, Antike Kunstprosa I, p. 70, note (extr.): "Dass die im Text behandelte Scheidung der *χαρακτήρες λέξεως* mit ihren benachbarten Fehlern auf Theophrastus zurückgeht . . . weist H. Rabe überzeugend nach." Radermacher, Rh. Mus. Vol. 54 (1899), p. 361. Wilamowitz, Hermes Vol. 35 (1900), p. 27, and note 1.

the following study is undertaken, with the further purpose of clearing the ground for a truer account (as I venture to hope) of the origin and meaning of this stylistic analysis.

The evidence, which has seemed to furnish proof for the prevailing view, is found in a passage of Dionysius de Dem. ch. 3. It will be cited later in its true connection, but here let it suffice to summarize briefly the argument from the beginning of the treatise to this point: Gorgias and Thucydides are named and characterized as representatives of the grand style (*λέξις περιττή* καὶ ἐγκατάσκευος and again *χαρακτήρ ὑψηλός*); the plain style, culminating in Lysias, then follows; finally, on the authority of Theophrastus, Thrasymachus is designated as the author of a mixed style or a mean (*μικτὴ λέξις* or *μεσότης*), which was further cultivated by Plato and Isocrates, and reached its highest development in Demosthenes. This evidence is used with much reserve by Westermann;¹ more confidently by Rabe, whose words I quote (l. c. p. 7): "Quia de tertio, mixto ex prioribus, Theophrasti iudicium affert, aperte tria illa genera eadem iam Theophrasto probata sunt." Again in recapitulation on p. 11 he attributes to the treatise *περὶ λέξεως* the three styles essentially as they stand in Dionysius, with the representatives of each as named by him. That in claiming all this for Theophrastus Rabe went too far has been generally recognized, especially in attributing to him the judgment of the pre-eminence of Demosthenes, which belongs to a later time.² Effective criticism may be made also against the probability of his naming Lysias as a representative of the plain style. In fact to conclude that Theophrastus conceived of the two other styles as Dionysius does, or named the same representatives of the different characters, or even that he made a classification of style in any such sense as Dionysius understands it, is to transcend the limits of legitimate inference from the data afforded. Theophrastus recognized Thrasymachus as the author of a *μικτὴ λέξις* or a

¹ Loc. cit.: "Im Ganzen scheint er, doch ohne sklavische Nachbeterei, auf dem von Aristoteles gelegten Grunde fortgebaut zu haben. Einzelne Theile erweiterte er, wie namentlich den Abschnitt über den rednerischen Ausdruck, wo er auch vielleicht zuerst die technische Scheidung der früher nur factisch bestehenden drei Arten des Stils begründete." And in note 8 ib. "Darauf führt Dionysius Hal. Lys. 6, Dem. 3."

² See Radermacher, Rh. Mus. 54, p. 379 extr. and Wilamowitz cited on p. 125. On the judgment of Demosthenes' rank as an orator see esp. Schmid, Rh. Mus. 49, p. 142, note 2.

μεσότης, and before proceeding to other inferences it must be our task to ascertain the meaning of this one piece of evidence. To anticipate a somewhat devious argument, which the meagreness of our record makes necessary, I shall endeavor to show: (1) that Theophrastus, following the teachings of his master, designated excellence of style as a mean (μεσότης) and named Thrasymachus as the first one to attain it; (2) that Dionysius with superficial apprehension of this conception has applied it to the doctrine, current in his time, of the three characters of style, identifying the Peripatetic mean with the so-called middle style; (3) that therefore, from this evidence at least, Theophrastus is not the source of this classification of styles, the true origin of which must be sought elsewhere.

For the proof of this we must turn first to Aristotle, since the singularly intimate relationship which existed between the two first Peripatetics affords a reasonable presumption that the position of the pupil will at least take its departure from the ideas of the master.

To define the attitude of Aristotle toward the artistic use of prose, has been a matter of some perplexity. On the one hand, we have the admiring judgments of his style from antiquity contrasting strikingly with the bald pragmatic language of most of his extant works. But in this respect the Constitution of Athens has served to prove what was suspected before, that the ancient judgments were not made with reference to the esoteric writings, but were rather based upon the dialogues and other works which addressed a general public. In the Rhetoric it is clear that Aristotle teaches with sympathetic appreciation a doctrine of style which corresponds essentially to the example set by Isocrates, from whom the largest number of illustrations are chosen. Even certain extremes of rhetorical ornament such as the Gorgianic figures, he still looks upon as legitimate resources of art.¹ But on the other hand the Rhetoric contains several utterances which betray a contempt for all stylistic embellishment in rhetorical practice, which might seem to point rather to such a theoretical position as Aristotle² has exemplified

¹ Rhet. III 9 1410 a 20 ἡδεῖα δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ τοιαύτη λέξις ὅτι τάναντία γνωριμώτατα καὶ παρ' ἀλλήλα μᾶλλον γνῶριμα.

² Rhet. III 1 1404 a 8 τὸ μὲν οὖν τῆς λέξεως ὅμως ἔχει τι μικρὸν ἀναγκαῖον ἐν πάσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ· διαφέρει γάρ τι πρὸς τὸ δηλῶσαι ὥδι ἢ ὥδι εἰπεῖν, οὐ μέντοι τοσοῦτον, ἀλλ' ἅπαντα φαντασία ταῦτ' ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἀκροατὴν· διὸ οὐδεὶς οὕτω γεωμετρεῖν διδάσκει.

practically in the esoteric writings. But such an inference would be unjustified. It is not the artistic use of language as such which provokes his contempt (as is the case with many later philosophers) but the use of such language, together with other resources of sophistical and histrionic art, to withdraw the mind of a court or an assembly from the real questions at issue. It was in fact an unfortunate accident that the theory and practice of prose style had been developed so largely in connection with the actual deliberation and adjudication of questions of public policy, of fact and right. These were problems which demanded the sobriety of unimpassioned consideration, and to Aristotle it seemed preposterous that important decisions of public and private import should in any degree be influenced by literary art: 'no one has ever dreamed of teaching geometry in that way' is his contemptuous comment.

But prose style as a work of art, absolved from the consideration of a concrete object of persuasion or dissuasion and comparable to the elaboration of language in the service of poetry, was a worthy goal of studious effort. It is from this point of view that most of the chapters *περὶ λέξεως* are written, though in some instances the inevitable preoccupation of stylistic theory with practical rhetoric intrudes itself. Aristotle is therefore not so much concerned with creating a theory of rhetorical style for practical use—and hence perhaps his neglect of the admirable forensic eloquence of Lysias, Isaeus and others—as with that artistic form of prose which had its origins in imitation of poetry,¹ and after its first excesses in the hands of Gorgias and his contemporaries had subsided into a position intermediate between poetry and the language of cultivated conversation. In vocabulary he demanded the employment of words in ordinary usage, depending upon metaphor rather than upon unusual or poetical words for literary effect.² This is the point of contact of his stylistic theory with the conversational idiom. Its poetical features depend rather upon composition (*σύνθεσις*) in its widest sense—the period, rhythm, the Gorgianic figures, etc.³ The apt use of these two elements—the choice of words and their compo-

¹ Rhet. III 1 1404 a 26 διὰ τοῦτο ποιητικὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο λέξις οἷον ἡ Γοργίου.

² Rhet. III 2 1404 b 28-35.

³ Rhet. III 2 1404 b 24 κλέπεται δ' εὖ ἂν τις ἐκ | τῆς εἰσθηνίας διαλέκτου ἐκλέγων συντιθεῖ· ὅπερ Εὐριπίδης ποιεῖ καὶ ὑπέδειξε πρῶτος. Cf. the Horatian—*tantum series iuncturaque pollet, || tantum de medio sumptis accedit honoris*.

sition—in the avoidance of baldness on the one hand and poetical exaggeration on the other, constitutes the excellence or virtue of style which is the mean. In poetry it had first been revealed by Euripides, whose relation therefore to Aeschylus, for example, would be comparable to the mean of prose style, which Aristotle inculcates, in its relation to the poetical excess of the style of Gorgias.

These points of view are set forth concisely in the famous definition of the excellence of style: *ὠρίσθω λέξεως ἀρετὴ σαφὴ εἶναι* (*σημεῖον γὰρ ὅτι ὁ λόγος, ὡς ἐὰν μὴ δηλοῖ, οὐ ποιήσει τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργον*) *καὶ μήτε ταπεινὴν μήτε ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα ἀλλὰ πρέπουσαν* (ch. 2 init.). I have ventured to quote so well-known a passage for the sake of pointing out that the significant and essential part of this definition does not lie in the demand for clearness (which is all that has often been taken from it¹), but in the second part, in which the conception of good writing as consisting in a mean² between the lack of ornament, and the excess of it is contained. Clearness is made a part of the definition, as being merely an indispensable preliminary to any other quality, a relationship which the parenthetical words should have made perfectly clear. But the artistic features of style are embraced in the second part of the definition “to be neither mean nor extravagant but appropriate.” The truth of this appears distinctly from a comparison with the similar definition in the Poetics, where the inadequacy of clearness alone from an artistic point of view is expressly stated: “The excellence of style is to be clear and not mean. That style is clearest which consists of words in their ordinary idiomatic uses, but it is mean” (ch. 22 init.).

The whole matter is summed up very clearly, with express recognition of the mean as the controlling principle of style, in chapter 12 (extr.): “To analyze further and to say that style must be pleasing and distinguished is superfluous. For the elements which have been named will make the style pleasing [and distinguished] if we have correctly defined excellence of

¹ Striller, *De Stoic. stud. rhet.* (Breslau, 1886), p. 50: *summamque eius (sc. dictionis) virtutem dicit τὸ σαφὴ εἶναι*. Saintsbury's strictures on the inadequacy of clearness as a definition of style are good (*History of Crit.* I, p. 43) but beside the point. Diels (*Abh. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1886, p. 12, 3): “*σαφές*, welches Aristoteles als allein nothwendig betrachtet.”

² Cf. Zeller, *Phil. d. Gr.* II 2 769, 2: “Das *πρέπον*, die richtige Mitte zwischen dem *ταπεινὸν* und dem *ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα*, der gänzlichen Schmucklosigkeit und der Ueberladung.”

style. For why must it be clear and not mean, but appropriate? Because if, for example, it is prolix it will not be clear, nor again if it is too concise. But it is plain that the mean is the fitting thing (*ἀλλὰ δῆλον ὅτι τὸ μέσον ἀρμόττει*). And the elements already named will render style pleasing and distinguished if they be wisely combined,¹ viz., the familiar and the strange, rhythm, and persuasiveness arising from the appropriate."

Although rhythm (ch. 8) and the period (ch. 9) are treated separately by Aristotle, yet this separation is apparently only in the interest of perspicuity. For that he conceives of the two as inseparably related appears from his whole treatment and especially from the demonstration of the advantages which both rhythm and the period contribute to style.²

Prose style must not become verse, nor, on the other hand, must it be wholly unrhythmical (*τὸ δὲ σχῆμα τῆς λέξεως δεῖ μῆτε ἔμμετρον εἶναι μῆτε ἄρρυθμον*, ch. 8 init.)—an injunction corresponding exactly to the law laid down in the definition of the virtue of style, *μῆτε ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα μῆτε ταπεινόν*. The wholly unrhythmical is the inartistic language of every-day life or of early prose literature; the excessively metrical is the early habit of artistic prose still in imitation of the poetry from which it took its rise. Thus between the extremes of *τὸ ἔμμετρον* and *τὸ ἄρρυθμον* there is the mean, viz., the use of rhythm, but rhythm not employed with the exactness of poetical metre (*ῥυθμὸν δὲ μὴ ἀκριβῶς*). Again within the territory of rhythm itself one must choose the fitting movement. The heroic rhythm is too stately and deficient in conversational quality, the iambic is too colloquial, the trochaic is the rhythm of broad comedy. The paean remains, the use of which began with Thrasymachus, though he and his followers could not define its nature.³ The paean comes third in order and is related to the forms that have been named; for it has the ratio of 3 to 2 (υ υ υ —), that is 1½, while the others have that of one to one (— — or — υ υ) and one to two (υ — or — υ)

¹ Rhet. III 1414 a 27 *ἀν εὖ μυχθῇ*. While conceivably the Aristotelian mean of style might be spoken of as a *μικτὴ λέξις*, it scarcely requires explanation that a mean would not result from a mixture of the two extremes. In this case each one of the elements which enters into the composition must also be a mean.

² Cf. Rhet. III 8 1408 b 27 (of the unrhythmical) *ἀηδὲς γὰρ καὶ ἀγνωστον τὸ ἀπειρον*, and III 9 1409 a 31 (of the unperiodic) *ἔστι δὲ ἀηδὲς διὰ τὸ ἀπειρον*.

³ Rhet. III 8 1409 a 2 *ὃ ἔχρωντο μὲν ἀπὸ Θρασυμάχου ἀρξάμενοι, οὐκ εἶχον δὲ λέγειν τίς ἦν*.

respectively; that is, one and one-half is connected with these ratios (1 and 2), or, as Cicero interprets in rendering this passage (Or. 193), it is a mean between them.

Here we have expressly affirmed and in concrete terms the same point of view which we found enunciated in regard to diction, viz., that the mean between the extremes named is the ideal at which to aim. The passage has for us, moreover, this further and conspicuous value, for the question which we are investigating, that it names Thrasy-machus as the first to use this mean in rhythm. Aristotle's further statement that Thrasy-machus and his followers, though they had hit upon the true rhythm, did not understand its nature, is very significant. For it implies not only that Thrasy-machus did not recognize the reason for the superiority of the paeon, but that subsequent rhetorical theorists had failed to grasp the nature of its excellence. In short, Aristotle claims for himself the merit of interpreting the paeon as a mean between the other available forms, and of thus referring its excellence to a reasoned principle. It is, as will be seen, the point of departure for Theophrastus' designation of Thrasy-machus as the source of the *μεσότης* of style in general.

In regard to the period, which is discussed in ch. 9, Aristotle does not expressly define the three elements of the triad which he names in regard to rhythm. There was first the merely continuous,¹ or "jointed" style (*λέξις εἰρομένη*), comparable to a straight line divided into sections at hap-hazard. As an example he names Herodotus, and cites the opening words of his history. It is displeasing for the same reason that the unrhythmical is disagreeable, as being infinite and undetermined.² The mind is afforded no natural halting places.³ The period, on the other hand, completes the thought within the compass of a certain rhythm, and so facilitates attention to the thought and makes easy its retention. The extreme is not here named, but obviously it is the same as in rhythm, i. e. a periodic structure which contains an excess of rhythmic rounding, which ceases to escape observation, and is recognized like verse. The extremes and the mean in the essential sense of Aristotle's thought, and

¹ An admirable illustration (better than Aristotle's example from Herodotus) is afforded by a fragment of Hecataeus which Norden (I 37) cites.

² Cf. Cicero de Or. III 186: *numerus autem in continuatione nullus est* (probably from Theophrastus).

³ Demetrius de Eloc. 47.

probably as defined and interpreted by Theophrastus, are given by Demetrius de Eloc. 15 δοκιμάζω γὰρ δὴ ἔγωγε μήτε περιόδοις δλον τὸν λόγον συνείρεσθαι, ὡς τοῦ Γοργίου, μήτε διαλελύσθαι δλον ὡς τὰ ἀρχαία, ἀλλὰ μεμῖχθαι μᾶλλον δι' ἀμφοτέρων.¹ It is obvious that the correct form of period could only be attained by the use of the correct rhythm and that brings us again to Thrasymachus. It is from this point of view that the invention of the period is attributed to Thrasymachus in Suidas (s. v.), a passage which will be cited presently.

Summary From this brief résumé of the most essential utterances of Aristotle concerning diction and rhythm, it is clear that the Aristotelian conception of excellence in style is based upon a doctrine of the mean (*μεσότης*) analogous to that which lies at the foundation of his political and ethical theories. It is put in most universal and philosophical connection with this thought in the definition of rhythm and the period (*τὸ πῆρας* and *τὸ ἀπειρον* in ch. 9); it appears in a more empirical and popular form in the injunctions concerning diction. The whole thought is summarized in the definition of the virtue of style,² which as we have seen is clearness as a necessary presumption (but not clearness alone, which could best be attained by a style quite without distinction,³) and embellishment restrained from poetical extravagance by appropriateness (*τὸ πρέπον*). Indeed throughout the Rhetoric *τὸ μέσον*, *τὸ μέτριον*, *τὸ πρέπον*, are almost interchangeable terms.

It may not unreasonably be said that the use of such general expressions as these in no way warrants the assumption that Aristotle means to apply to style that doctrine of the mean which is so explicitly unfolded in the Ethics. But while it is true that the principle is nowhere expressly laid down, yet not only in the utterances already cited is it implied, but it is also contained in some of its more technical aspects in several passages of the

¹ For a similar formulation of the matter with indication of Theophrastus as its source, see Cicero de Or. III 184.

² Thus Cicero applies to Aristotle's approval of the paean the very words of the definition of the *ἀρετὴ λέξεως* (Or. 192): ita neque humilem et abiectam orationem nec nimis altam et exaggeratam probat (Aristoteles), plenam tamen eam vult esse gravitatis ut eos qui audient ad maiorem admirationem possit traducere.

³ Cf. Poet. 22 init. *σαφειστάτη μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκ τῶν κυρίων ὀνομάτων (λέξεις), ἀλλὰ ταπεινὴ.*

Rhetoric which call for a little more detailed explanation.¹ In the first place, the ideal of style is ἀρετή like the ideal of conduct.² Furthermore as defined in the Ethics (II 5 init.) every ἀρετή has its corresponding ἔργον, and the ἀρετή is determined or defined as an efficient with reference to that which it has to effect (ἔργον). Thus the first element of the definition of style is σαφὴ εἶναι, which is thereupon justified by the parenthetical explanation, σημεῖον γὰρ ὅτι ὁ λόγος, ὡς ἐὰν μὴ δηλοῖ, οὐ ποιήσει τὸ ἐαυτοῦ ἔργον.

Ethical ἀρετή is a mean between two extremes. But the same is true of every ἀρετή, for the doctrine of the mean in ethics is derived from a universal principle and interpreted by Aristotle in its special application to ethics. It follows, therefore, that the universal elements of the doctrine are applicable to rhetoric as well. The general principle of the mean set forth in II 5 1106a 26 ff., I paraphrase as follows: "Everything, whether it be conceived of as continuous or discrete, admits of the terms more, less and equal, either absolutely (κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα) or relatively to ourselves (πρὸς ἡμᾶς). Using the terms relatively, they are excess, deficiency, and the mean. Virtue, therefore, is such a mean; not an absolute mean, as when one says that 6 is a mean

¹ I should have considered it unnecessary to justify this position (further than has been done), were it not that Cope criticises Brandis 'for ascribing too much ethical philosophy to the Rhetoric' in affirming that reference 'to the famous doctrine of the mean' is found in the enumeration of virtues in I 9. (Cf. Cope, Int. to Arist. Rhet., p. 97 and note, and Brandis, Über Arist. Rhetorik in Philologus vol. IV (1849), p. 31, and n. 50). But, just as in this chapter of book I Aristotle, as I think, undoubtedly has in mind the triad of his ethical theory, and yet because of the more popular character of the Rhetoric refrains from setting forth its theoretical basis, so in the third book he uses the principle in an empirical and popular way without detailed explanation of its application to style. There are of course other considerations connected with the origin and character of book III which cannot here be discussed. It should be added that brief recognition of the doctrine of the mean in Aristotle's theory of style has been made by Chaignet, La Rhétorique et son Histoire, and by Roberts, Demetrius, p. 39. Cf. Zeller cited above, p. 129.

² In this connection emphasis should be laid on the fact that Aristotle does not speak of 'virtues' of style as is customary in later rhetoric, (for him its excellence is a unit—ἡ ἀρετή, and Cope (whom Welldon follows) is wholly in error in translating ὡρίσθω ἀρετὴ λέξεως: 'let it be regarded as settled once for all, that *one* virtue of style is to be perspicuous.' Cope was misled, I presume, by the absence of the article. But it is used in ch. 12 extr. 1414 a 23 and ch. 2 1404 b 37.

between 2 and 10, but a mean varying between two extremes in accordance with individual capacity or idiosyncrasy. Thus, if two pounds of food be too little for a man, and ten pounds too much, a trainer will not therefore prescribe six pounds. For the practised athlete this will be too little, for the beginner in athletic training, too much." This is a truth susceptible of the widest application, and from its recognition in regard to every other field of knowledge or skill (*πᾶσα ἐπιστήμη, οἱ ἀγαθοὶ τεχνῖται* 1106 b 8 and 13) its applicability to moral virtue is deduced.

As stated above, the doctrine of the mean, as applied to rhetoric, is seen in its most philosophical aspect in the treatment of rhythm, where, as we saw, the *ἄρρυθμον* is found unsuitable for style as being limitless (*ἀηδὲς γὰρ καὶ ἄγνωστον τὸ ἄπειρον*, Rhet. III 8 init.). But limit or definition the mind requires for its satisfaction, and therefore in style such a limit is agreeable from its opposition to the undefined (*ἡδεῖα διὰ τὸ ἐναντίας ἔχειν τῷ ἀπεράντῳ*, ch. 9, 1409 b 2). The general principle is derived from a piece of Pythagorean symbolism, which Aristotle cites in Ethics II 6, 1106 b 29: *τὸ κακὸν τοῦ ἀπείρου, ὡς οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι εἰκαζον, τὸ δὲ ἀγαθὸν τοῦ πεπερασμένου*. But prose differs from poetry in not being subject to absolute definition or law, which in language is *τὸ ἔμμετρον*. Therefore the ideal will be a relative mean between these extremes: *διὸ ρυθμὸν δεῖ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον . . . ρυθμὸν δὲ μὴ ἀκριβῶς*. Rhet. ch. 8 1408 b 30.

In conduct the chief practical question is the means of attaining the *μεσότης*. This is to be determined by right reason, *ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος* (VI 1, 1) and by this statement he means "that our action must correspond to the standard which exists in the rightly ordered mind. What is subjectively the *λόγος*, law or standard, that is objectively the *μεσότης* or balance."¹ The task of right conduct, therefore, for a rational man, consists in the employment of a constant series of checks and spurs, in relaxing (*ἀνιέναι*) and intensifying (*ἐπιτείνειν*) his activity to maintain his position within the narrow limits of the mean, as determined by his individuality and reason. (Cf. Eth. II 9, and esp. VI 1). In rhetoric and poetry (as perhaps in art generally) that which corresponds to the right reason is the subjective feeling of the appropriate, *τὸ πρέπον*, and this it is which is the guide to the attainment of the mean between the excess and the deficiency of form and elaboration in language. But in prose, as well as in

¹ Grant, Arist. Ethics Vol. I, p. 206.

verse, the sense of the appropriate constantly dictates expansion and contraction to meet the varying conditions which, in each given case, constitute the mean: ἀλλ' ἔστι καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἐπισυστελλόμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον τὸ πρέπον (III 2 1404 b 17). The language is brief and gives no more than a suggestion of that which is implicitly contained in it. But it will be observed that the appropriate is the result of the same principle of relaxation and restraint which 'right reason' imposes in the attainment of the ethical mean.¹ This essential identity in principle of the virtue of style with moral virtue is explained similarly, but with much greater clearness, in an Aristotelian fragment on brevity, preserved in the so-called *Ars Cornuti* (Spengel I² 2, p. 370): εἰ γὰρ ἔστι, φησὶν, ἡ συντομία συμμετρία τις μήτε παραλείπουσά τι τῶν ἀναγκαίων μήτε πλεονάζουσα, ἀρετὴ γενήσεται. εἰ δέ ἐστιν ὥσπερ ἔνδειά τις ὑπερβαίνουσά τι τῶν χρησίων, ἐν ταῖς κακίαις μᾶλλον ταχθήσεται.² "If brevity be conceived of as a mean (*συμετρία*) neither omitting anything that is necessary nor containing more than is necessary, let it be called a virtue. But if it is, so to say, a deficiency, passing over things that are serviceable, let it rather rank with faults." The fragment (from whatever source) interprets the well-known passage of the *Rhetoric* III 16 1416 b 30³ on the same subject, but has for us the special value of applying in definite terms to style the doctrine of the deficiency, the extreme and the mean.

¹ The conception of the appropriate as consisting in a constant adaptation to "environment" (subjective and objective) and hence as pulsating, so to speak, within the legitimate limits of contraction and relaxation (*ἐπισυστελλόμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον τὸ πρέπον*) is widely diffused in post-Aristotelian literature of artistic theory. For the art of acting (declamation) see *de Or.* III 102 and cf. I 254. For music III 102: neque id actores prius viderunt quam ipsi poetae, quam denique illi etiam qui fecerunt modos, a quibus utrisque summittitur aliquid deinde augetur, extenuatur inflatur, variatur distinguitur. For literature (quid aptum sit) III 212: ornamentis eisdem uti fere licebit alias contentius, alias summissius. This is the true interpretation (though it has apparently not been recognized) of the well-known Horatian line, *Serm.* I 10, 13: interdum urbani, *parentis* viribus atque || *extenuantis* eas consulto.

It should be noted finally that the doctrine of the three styles is frequently brought under this point of view, though it has not its origin in it.

² Cf. *Eth.* II 6, 9 (1106 b 9): ὅθεν εἰώθασιν ἐπιλέγειν τοῖς εὖ ἔχουσιν ἔργοις ὅτι οὔτε ἀφελεῖν ἔστιν οὔτε προσθεῖναι, ὥς τῆς μὲν ὑπερβολῆς καὶ τῆς ἑλλείψεως φθειρούσης τὸ εὖ, τῆς δὲ μεσότητος σφζούσης.

³ III 16 1416 b 30: νῦν δὲ γελοιῶς τὴν δόγην φασὶ δεῖν εἶναι ταχεῖαν κτλ. . . οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνταῦθά ἐστι τὸ εὖ ἢ τὸ ταχὺ ἢ τὸ συντόμως, ἀλλὰ τὸ μετρίως.

It is clear that here was a principle of style based upon a general philosophical thought, and as definite in its formulation as the nature of the subject allowed. There is but one conception of good writing, as of right conduct, viz. the *μεσότης*. But it is in no sense a doctrine of uniformity. On the contrary, individualism is its dominant characteristic, as truly as in the case of moral virtue.¹ The differentiating, modifying element is τὸ πρέπον, which has many aspects; they are summarized in later rhetoric thus: πρὸς τὸν λέγοντα καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀκούοντας καὶ πρὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα· ἐν τούτοις γὰρ δὴ καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τὸ πρέπον (Dionysius de Lysia ch. 9), and in this reference to the personality of the speaker, the character of the subject-matter and the nature of the audience provision was made for every style of oratory and every shade of individual idiosyncrasy within the bounds of the appropriate. This is shown very admirably by Dionysius, who, in explaining his three characters of composition, sets forth the σύνθεσις κοινή or μέση in terms which are drawn from the Aristotelian conception of style in general, and which were never meant to be applied to a particular type of style: οἱ τε χρησάμενοι αὐτῇ οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ πάντες οὐδ' ὁμοίως ἐπετήδευσαν, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ταῦτα μᾶλλον, οἱ δ' ἐκείνα, ἐπέτεινάν τε καὶ ἀνῆκαν ἄλλως ἄλλοι τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ πάντες ἐγένοντο λόγον ἄξιοι κατὰ πάσας τὰς ἰδέας τῶν λόγων (de Comp. ch. 24). It will be apparent, therefore, that the Aristotelian doctrine of the mean could never have tolerated the definition of types of style in the sense of the χαρακτηρὲς λέξεως conceived of as types of individualism. For every character of style there was but a single and universal precept, σαφὴ εἶναι as an indispensable prerequisite, modified and corrected by the essential artistic consideration καὶ πρέπουσαν.

We have next to consider a question of much greater difficulty, viz., the relationship of Theophrastus to the theory of style which we have thus outlined as contained with more or less definiteness of implication in the Rhetoric of Aristotle. It may be assumed in general that the vital points of the Aristotelian theory would not suffer serious alteration at his hands. This relationship is formulated by Diels² on the basis of a number of very interesting examples in which a sharper and more precise definition of

¹ Cf. Zeller, Vol. II 2, p. 632: "Die Aufgabe unserer sittlichen Thätigkeit kann nur die sein, im Verhältniss zur menschlichen Eigenthümlichkeit die richtige Mitte zu treffen."

² Über das dritte Buch d. aristotelischen Rhetorik. Abh. d. Berl. Akademie 1886, p. 25 ff.

Aristotle's ideas is discernible. In the following I hope to add some further illustrations of the general relationship which shall show that Theophrastus acted as the interpreter of the extremely concise and esoteric language of his master. But especially I desire to make it plain by means of authentic fragments of Theophrastus that his conception of the 'virtue of style' was the same as that of Aristotle and therefore wholly alien to the division into *χαρακτῆρες* now commonly attributed to him.

One point which undoubtedly required fuller explanation than is accorded to it in Aristotle was exactly this conception of the ideal of style as being a mean between the total absence of ornament and the poetical excess of it, whether in regard to the choice of words or to rhythm and composition. And here it can be shown beyond question that Theophrastus defined for a larger audience the implications of the Aristotelian quasi-technical terminology.

We have already seen that Aristotle named Thrasyarchus as the first to introduce the appropriate rhythm into prose, and furthermore that he defined the nature of the paeon, and so gave a philosophical justification for its excellence. But the Aristotelian definition is abstract, not to say obscure (v. supra, p. 130), and much in need of practical interpretation. This was afforded by Theophrastus, as we learn from Demetrius de Eloc. 41: *διόπερ Θεόφραστος παράδειγμα ἐκτίθεται μεγαλοπρεπείας τὸ τοιοῦτον κῶλον . . . οὐ γὰρ ἐκ παιῶνων ἀκριβῶς, ἀλλὰ παιωνικὸν τί ἐστιν. παραλαβεῖν μέντοι τὸν παῖωνα εἰς τοὺς λόγους, ἐπειδὴ μικτός τις ἐστὶ καὶ ἀσφαλέστερος, τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές μὲν ἐκ τῆς μακρᾶς λαμβάνων, τὸ λογικὸν δὲ ἐκ τῶν βραχειῶν.* Here, then, are several things that call for comment; but let it be noted, first of all, that Theophrastus (in the words *ἐπειδὴ μικτός τις ἐστὶ*) interprets in intelligible and practical terms the rigorously theoretical definition of his master.¹ In the second place, it appears that Theophrastus interpreted more freely Aristotle's demand that the paeon be employed. He therefore enjoins that the rhythm shall not consist of strict paeans, but shall be paeonic.² The passage is cited by Demetrius in his treatment

¹ Cf. Diels (l. c.) p. 28, n. 1: "Den Paeon selbst empfahl Theophrastus nicht aus den von Aristoteles empfohlenen Gründen, sondern weil er *μικτός τις ἐστὶ κτλ.*" But the explanation of the excellence of the paeon is the same in both cases; the one is a mathematical, the other a practical formulation of the same observation.

² A fuller record of Theophrastus' thought on this point is preserved by Cicero de Or. III 184 and 185.

of the *χαρακτήρ μεγαλοπρεπής*, so that it has not unnaturally been thought of as contributing evidence to the belief that Theophrastus defined such a stylistic type, corresponding to the later *χαρακτήρ ἀδρός* or *ὑψηλός*. Such an inference, however, is quite unwarranted: for, as we have seen, (1) the conception of the rhythm of *μεγαλοπρέπεια* which is here advanced corresponds exactly to the Aristotelian conception of the true nature of prose rhythm in general. Consequently, (2) if the rhythm here advocated were attached in Theophrastus to any one style, such as those defined at a later time, it could only be to a *χαρακτήρ μέσος*, since the rhythm advocated possesses 'distinction from the long syllable and conversational quality (*τὸ λογικόν*) from the shorts.' (3) The truth is that the paean is defined and illustrated by Theophrastus as the appropriate rhythm for artistic prose style in general, and as we know from other sources¹ Theophrastus defined as a universal quality of artistic prose *τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές*, in spite of the fact that such a definition had been declared superfluous by Aristotle.

It was further noted above that although it was an easy inference from Aristotle's account to conclude that he would have named Thrasymachus as the first to attain the excellence of style arising from a correct periodic form, that nevertheless he does not do so. It remained for Theophrastus to state expressly what is apparently implied in Aristotle. For that he is the source of Suidas' attribution to Thrasymachus of the introduction of the period and colon has been conjectured (by Blass and others). It can, I think, be definitely proven. Suidas, s. v. *Thrasymachus*: *πρῶτος περίοδον καὶ κῶλον κατέδειξε καὶ τὸν νῦν τῆς ῥητορικῆς τρόπον εἰσηγήσατο*. With this compare Dionysius de Lysia 6: *ἀρετὴν εὐρίσκω παρὰ Λυσία πάντῃ θαυμαστήν, ἥς Θεόφραστος μὲν φησιν ἄρξαι Θρασύμαχον . . . ἣ συστρέφουσα τὰ νοήματα καὶ στρογγύλως ἐκφέρουσα λέξις*.² This is generally interpreted and was understood by Dionysius as a specially compact and incisive form of periodic structure suited to forensic and agonistic oratory generally. But though this may have been true of the periods of Thrasymachus,

¹ Cic. Or. 79 *affluens* — *μεγαλοπρεπές*. Dionys. Isoc. ch. 3.

² *Στρογγύλος* is used of the new stylistic artifices of the sophistical rhetoric by Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 686 (*στρογγύλοις τοῖς ῥήμασιν*) and by Plato, *Phaedr.* 234 E. In later usage it is constantly used of periodic composition. Cf. Demetr. de Eloc. 20: *τῆς δὲ ῥητορικῆς περιόδου συνεστραμμένον τὸ εἶδος καὶ κυκλικὸν καὶ δεόμενον στρογγύλου στόματος* and v. Ernesti, *Lex. Tech.* s. v.

yet the description is equally that of the period in general, which as defined by Aristotle consists in the compression and completion of the thought within the rounding of the rhythm, from which characteristic the name period is derived.

But Theophrastus went further. He not only recognized Thrasymachus as the inaugurator of the mean in rhythm and originator of the period, but he credited to him the authorship of the mean in diction as well, thus according to him in all respects that position in the history of style which Aristotle had assigned to him in respect to rhythm alone. This inference must be drawn from Dionysius, de Dem. ch. 3, the passage from which our inquiry started: *τρίτη λέξεως <ιδέα?> ἦν ἡ μικτή τε καὶ σύνθετος ἐκ τούτων τῶν δυεῖν, ἣν ὁ μὲν πρῶτος ἀρμολύμενος καὶ καταστήσας εἰς τὸν νῦν ὑπάρχοντα κόσμον εἶπε Θρασύμαχος ὁ Καλχηδόνιος ἦν, ὡς οἶται Θεόφραστος, εἶπε ἄλλος τις, οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν. . . ἡ μὲν οὖν Θρασυμάχου λέξις, εἰ δὴ πηγὴ τις ἦν ὄντως τῆς μεσότητος κτλ.*¹

But in this connection, where it is seen that Theophrastus is only moving further along the lines laid down by Aristotle, the *μεσότης*, which Thrasymachus was the first to attain, appears in a totally different light from the middle style of later theory, in connection with which Dionysius has preserved for us this precious bit of early Peripatetic teaching. In the later doctrine of the characters the *μέσος* is one of three general types of style, any one of which is admirable, and all of which have at different times found distinguished representatives.² But in Aristotle the mean is the only goal to aim at, a doctrine so essential and vital to the Peripatetic system that it will not appear probable a priori that Theophrastus should have introduced a modification of it. The attainment of the mean in style by Thrasymachus was the discovery of that which was right, and when once found it defined the lines along which good writing must move henceforth.³ Thus

¹ In this passage *μικτὴ λέξις* represents Dionysius' conception of the middle style. Theophrastus' terms appear at the end: *εἰ δὴ πηγὴ τις ἦν ὄντως* (sc. as Theophrastus had said) *τῆς μεσότητος*.

² Cf. Varro (ap. Gell. VI 14, 4): His singulis orationis *virtutibus* (said of the three styles) vitia agnata sunt pari numero. In the Peripatetic conception the *μεσότης* only could be a *virtus*. Note also Cic. Or. 20: Tria sunt omnino genera dicendi, quibus in singulis quidam floruerunt, etc.

³ Cf. Cic. Or. 208: Itaque posteaquam est nata haec vel circumscriptio vel comprehensio vel continuatio vel ambitus, si ita licet dicere, nemo qui aliquo esset in numero scripsit orationem generis eius quod esset ad delectationem comparatum . . . quin redigeret omnis fere in quadrum numerumque sententias.

Aristotle had said of the *λέξις εἰρομένη*, that it was the earlier prose style and all had formerly used it: *νῦν δὲ οὐ πολλοὶ χρῶνται*—that is, with the discovery of the advantages of the periodic style and its correct rhythmical form, it had come to prevail. And so of the mean in general, its recognition by artistic writers was inevitable when once it was apprehended and exemplified. Therefore Theophrastus said in defining the merit of Thrasy-machus that he had introduced *τὸν νῦν τῆς ῥητορικῆς τρόπον* (Suidas, *supra*), and Dionysius, with a suggestion of the same phraseology: *καταστήσας εἰς τὸν νῦν ὑπάρχοντα κόσμον*. Manifestly the *μεσότης* was to Theophrastus not *a* style, but *the* style—the necessary goal, to which the art of prose writing had at length attained in his time (*νῦν*).

But though we have seen that Theophrastus named Thrasy-machus as the first to attain the *μεσότης* of style, yet for a more satisfactory proof of our contention, that this testimony is to be interpreted in the sense of the Peripatetic mean, some further evidence may be adduced. In Aristotle's definition of the excellence of style, as we have seen, the conception of the mean is contained in the idea of appropriateness. This appropriateness of language is elsewhere designated as *ἡ οἰκεία λέξις* (III 7 1408 a 20). Violation of the appropriate in the direction of excess (*ὑπερβολή*) constitutes tastelessness or frigidity (*τὰ ψυχρά*). To be sure Aristotle nowhere in his treatment of frigidity (ch. 3) defines the error expressly as an excess, but this conception is implicit in his whole discussion of the subject and is made clear especially in his treatment of epithets. "Some are wholly unsuited to prose and the frequent employment of others exposes the art of the composition and makes it plain that it is poetry: nevertheless such embellishment must be used as giving variety to the language of everyday life, and investing it with strangeness and dignity:" the passage concludes with the warning—*ἀλλὰ δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι τοῦ μετρίου*. (III 3 1406 a 10 ff.).

Theophrastus, interpreting the implications of his master's teaching, supplies the missing definition: *ὀρίζεται δὲ τὸ ψυχρὸν*

See also Brut. 30 and 66 (the simpler style of Thucydides and Lysias was suppressed by the more elaborate language of Theopompus and Demosthenes). The attitude of Aristotle toward rhythmic prose, which was the accepted type of artistic composition in his time, as the necessary and logical development of style finds an analogue in his remark concerning the developed type of tragedy: *καὶ πολλὰς μεταβολὰς μεταβαλοῦσα ἡ τραγῳδία ἐπαύσατο ἐπεὶ ἔσχε τὴν αὐτῆς φύσιν* (Poet. ch. 5 ad fin.).

θεόφραστος οὕτως· ψυχρόν ἐστι τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τὴν οἰκείαν ἀπαγγελίαν (Demetr. de Eloc. 114). The fragment is brief, but it contains not a little for the reconstruction of Theophrastus' point of view, apart from the designation of the error as an excess (ὑπερβολή). In Demetrius who quotes the passage frigidity is the παρέκβασις or error of the *χαρακτήρ μεγαλοπρεπείας*, and to each of his other three styles he assigns a corresponding form of error or excess. From this point of view it is but one source of error to which a single style is prone. But in Aristotle it represents deviation from the appropriate (on the side of excess) in the most general sense: and so in Theophrastus—ὑπερβάλλον τὴν οἰκείαν ἀπαγγελίαν. Therefore Theophrastus defined but one excess of style, *ψυχρότης*,¹ transcending the just mean. It is probable that Theophrastus placed under the heading of frigidity deviations from the appropriate on the side of excess of all kinds, and classified them in accordance with his general division into *ἐκλογή τῶν ὀνομάτων*, *σύνθεσις* and *σχήματα*. Undoubtedly most of the matter which is common to Demetrius and Aristotle on this subject represents the formulation of Theophrastus.²

The obvious analogies between the Peripatetic conception of stylistic and ethical ἀρετή, to which attention was called above, must have always made illustration of the former by the latter a very natural thing for a Peripatetic teacher, especially since the doctrine of the mean in all its implications had been most fully illustrated by the master in his Ethics. Now we find in Demetrius that the definition of "frigidity" which we have just considered, is prefaced by some analogous examples of the ethical mean and extreme: ὥσπερ δὲ παρίκειται φαῦλά τινα ἀστείους τισίν, οἷον θάρρει μὲν τὸ θράσος, ἡ δὲ αἰσχύνῃ τῇ αἰδοί, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν παράκεινται διημαρτημένοι τινές (114). That is, as the moral virtues have their related faults or excesses, as for instance, rashness in relation to courage, so also the characters of style stand related to certain faulty types. While it may not be urged that this explanation must go back to Theophrastus, yet it is clear that unless stylistic virtue had been conceived of as a mean, the illustration by examples from the ethical triad would be entirely pointless. The ethical traits which

¹ Interesting confirmation of this conclusion is found in the fact that practically all that Demetrius has to say of his other *παρεκβάσεις* is contained in his treatment of *ψυχρότης*.

² Note for example what is said in Demetrius 117 and 118.

are cited are only given to illustrate the relations of mean and extreme, not as being in themselves in any way analogous to stylistic virtue and its excess. But a little further on the illustration is developed by the selection of an ethical extreme more closely analogous in its nature to the rhetorical excess in question: *καὶ καθόλου ὁποῖόν τί ἐστὶν ἡ ἀλαζονεία, τοιοῦτον καὶ ἡ ψυχρότης* (119)—a comparison which is then carried out with some fulness of treatment.

X The evidence now adduced should suffice, I think, to show that Theophrastus accepted from his master the doctrine of the *ἀρετή* of style as a mean, defined the conception explicitly, and illustrated it perhaps by the analogy of the ethical mean and extreme. It should also be clear that such a theory did not admit of the definition of types of style, just as it has been shown that the correct interpretation of the data concerning Theophrastus does not in fact point to the existence of any such division. All good writing observes a balance or mean. Faulty writing errs chiefly on the side of excess. The deficiency (*ἔλλειψις*) of mere colloquialism is less censurable (see *Rhet.* III 3 1406 a 16); but undoubtedly Theophrastus would have condemned it with Aristotle as *ταπεινή*.

C Now it is obvious that in this we have something entirely different from the doctrine of the three characters of style which we find in Gellius (Varro), the author ad Herennium, Cicero, Dionysius, etc. To reconcile with this analysis the Peripatetic theory it would be necessary to assume that, while originally the *χαρακτήρ μέσος* was the only good style, and the *ισχνός* and *ἀδρός* were respectively the *ἔλλειψις* and *ὑπερβολή*, yet in time these latter had come to be recognized as worthy types of style—*virtutes* as Gellius (Varro) calls them, and not erroneous deviations from the *ἀρετή*. This would be a conceivable development, under the influence of certain changes in the attitude of literary taste toward the older monuments of Greek prose, between the time of Theophrastus and the beginning of the first century B. C.; but unfortunately this hypothesis does not account for the most characteristic features of the descriptions of the three styles. For in the first place if the Peripatetic theory had become transformed in this way, we must at least have looked for the consistent survival of its vital principle of the superiority of the middle style. But Demetrius, who as is generally agreed made most immediate use of the Peripatetic sources, has no middle

style at all, but gives the essential features of the Peripatetic *μεσότης* of style in his *χαρακτήρ μεγαλοπρεπής*. Again Cicero and Quintilian, while deprecating the exclusive use of any one style, designate the *genus grande* as without question the most admirable.¹ To the writer "On the Sublime," also, elevation (*ὑψος*, *χαρακτήρ ὑψηλός* in Dionysius) is the decisive criterion in determining oratorical excellence.

Of all our sources Dionysius is the only one in whom the *χαρακτήρ μέσος* appears as the most admirable of the styles. But on closer examination it will be found that his conception bears only a crude external resemblance to the Peripatetic idea of the mean. For him there are but two fundamental styles, the simple and the grand, and the excellence of the *μέσος* consists in the fact that by combining the two the range of style is increased. In Dionysius' conception the representative of the middle style is thought of rather as having two independent styles at his command, than as the user of one. This is seen very clearly in the characterization of Plato (de Dem. ch. 5). In fact the two styles stand over against each other in diametrical (or 'diapasonal') opposition, and so far as the one approaches the other it loses something of its complete perfection (*δεινοὶ μὲν ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶν ἔργοις ἀμφοτέροι* [sc. Lysias and Thucydides], *καθ' ὃ δὲ ἴσοι ἀλλήλων ἦσαν, ἀτελεῖς*. Dem. 2 extr.).² But the Peripatetic conception is something wholly different; for in the sliding scale of the relative mean a theory existed which conceived of style, whether it found expression in simple language of presentation or in more elevated tones of emotion, as a unit, not always alike but always consistent and appropriate.

Thus every good style (so only it avoided excess) observed the mean. This doctrine passed into later rhetoric not as a *χαρακτήρ μέσος*, but as the obvious principle of appropriateness,³ the *aurea mediocritas*, applicable to all good writing whether simple or elaborate, argumentative or emotional. Let an illustration make the matter clear. In the Brutus (146) Cicero

¹ Cf. Cicero, Or. 99: at vero hic noster quem principem ponimus. Quint. XII 10, 63-65.

² The same point of view appears in Demetrius 36: *μόνος δὲ ὁ μεγαλοπρεπής τῷ ἰσχυρῷ οὐ μίγνεται, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἀνθέστατον καὶ ἀντίκεισθον ἐναντιωτάτῳ, διὸ δὴ καὶ μόνους δύο χαρακτήρας τινες ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναι τούτους κτλ.*; it is refuted by Hermogenes II 316, 31 (Spg.).

³ Cf. Cicero Or. 73: in omnibus rebus videndum est quatenus: etsi enim suus cuique modus est, tamen magis offendit nimium quam parum.

contrasts the orator Crassus with the jurisconsult Scaevola. Scaevola was a model of clear argumentative style: fuit nobis orator in hoc interpretandi explanandi edisserendi genere mirabilis, sic ut simile nihil viderim; but he was deficient in those rhetorical qualities, in which the strength of Crassus lay: in augendo, in ornando, etc. The two men represent the two extremes of oratorical habit which Cicero constantly uses in his characterizations. But he concludes thus (149): cum omnis virtus sit, ut vestra, Brute, vetus Academia dixit, mediocritas, uterque horum medium quiddam volebat sequi. To the same point of view belongs the discussion near the beginning of the third book de Oratore (25-37), in which is set forth with much admirable illustration the theory of individual excellence with absence of uniformity. Development of individuality and not conformity to an external standard is the goal toward which the teacher must direct his pupils' effort (35). For all he will set the standard of a personal mean, checking excess here, spurring on a deficiency there, as Isocrates did with Theopompus and Ephorus—neque eos similis effecit inter se, sed tantum alteri adfinxit, de altero limavit, ut id conformaret in utroque quod utriusque natura pateretur (36). It is from this standpoint that Quintilian repudiates the significance of the division into styles for the training of his orator, cum omnis species quae modo recta est, habeat usum, atque id ipsum non sit oratoris, quod vulgo genus dicendi vocant (XII 10, 69). For his style will vary with the thousand varying conditions of each occasion: dicet idem graviter severe, acriter vehementer, concitate copiose, amare comiter, remisse subtiliter, blande leniter, breviter urbane, non ubique similis, sed *ubique par sibi* (ib. 71)—that is, amidst all variety there must be preserved the unity of individual character and temperament which for each person is the mean.

All good writing is thus a *μεσότης*¹ and so in fact Demetrius conceived of each of the four styles which he postulates, as is

¹ This general principle of the mean in style may be illustrated by a few representative examples. In the introduction to the discussion of ornatus in de Or. III 97 we have the complete triad in the warning against *nimia suavitas*: ne exilis, ne inculta sit vestra oratio (*ἐλλειψις*); (98) quae maxime sensus nostros impellunt voluptate et specie prima acerrime commovent, ab eis celerime fastidio quodam et satietate abalienemur (*ὑπερβολή*). The *μεσότης* is delectare sine satietate (97) and allusion to it is made especially in the illustrations in 99 unguentis *moderatis*, in ipso tactu esse *modum*. The fluctuating variety of (*ἐπερὶ εὐεῖν, ἀνιέναι*) perfect art is touched on in 100 and 102.

shown by his comparison of them to types of the ethical mean (see above p. 141). Similarly in Gellius (Varro) the *tria probabilia genera dicendi* are *virtutes* and this is the consistent attitude toward them which is found in all our sources, even including Dionysius. Concerning Dionysius it is to be said that his unique interpretation of the *χαρακτήρ μέσος* is merely an effort to apply to the current formula of the plain, the middle and the grand style the Peripatetic doctrine of the excellence of the mean. The application was necessarily very superficial, because the tradition of the three styles, as we have seen, did not admit of the classification of either the grand or the plain style as erroneous forms. The true reason for his interpretation lay in a desire to give a quasi-philosophical explanation for the pre-eminence of Demosthenes. The writer "On the Sublime" (ch. 34, 2) denies to Demosthenes that Protean versatility which other ancient criticism accords to him almost without dissent, and finds in his flashes of sublimity the source of his acknowledged pre-eminence; Cicero holds that Demosthenes stands above the three styles and commands them all; Dionysius with slight variation of this conception—since he recognizes but two independent oratorical styles—attained the same end by attributing to Demosthenes the complete development of the style which was blended of the plain and the grand.

That this explanation of the pre-eminence of Demosthenes is but one of many interpretations which were offered, may be seen from the fact that Dionysius himself in the first part of the treatise *De antiquis oratoribus* explains the origin of Demosthenes' style in a wholly different and more rational way. It was Isaeus, he points out, the master of Demosthenes, whose skilful technique of argumentation and style afforded the starting-point (*τὰ σπέρματα καὶ τὰς ἀρχάς*) for the resourcefulness (*δεινότης*) of Demosthenes,¹ and for this reason Dionysius included Isaeus in his treatment

For rhythm see also Or. 178. The chapter of Quintilian on the *genera dicendi* (XII 10) concludes with similar warning against excess: *sic erunt magna, non nimia, sublimia non abrupta*, etc. . . . *similis in ceteris ratio est ac tutissima fere per medium via, quia utriusque ultimum vitium est* (80). In the scholastic rhetoric of late antiquity we find this point of view comprehended in the following formula: *bonus modus est in loquendo tamquam in ambulando, clementer ire sine curriculo sine cunctatione* (Marius Victorinus, *de sermocinatione*, p. 447 Halm)—a passage which is amplified with some amusing pedantry by Albinus, *ib.* 547, 34 ff.

¹ Dionys., Isaeus 20 extr. Cf. 3: *ἡ δὲ Ἰσαίου (λέξις) τεχνικωτέρα . . . καὶ πηγὴ τῆς οὕτως ἐστὶ τῆς Δημοσθένους δυνάμεως*.

(along with Lysias and Isocrates)¹. At the end of the treatise on Isaeus the early orators are classified into two groups, *οἱ ποιητικοί* (of whom Isocrates is the representative), and *οἱ ἀκριβεῖς* (Lysias), with no mention of a middle class, while Thrasyarchus is placed among the *ἀκριβεῖς*. Indeed throughout the first part of the work *De antiquis oratoribus* (Lysias, Isocrates, isaeus) I have not observed a single allusion to the doctrine of the three styles. On the other hand the true Peripatetic conception of style as a relative mean, subject to the requirements of appropriateness, is expressed in characterization of Lysias ch. 9 (*πρὸς τὴν ἀκροατὴν συμμετρῆται τὰ λεγόμενα οἰκείως, κτλ.*), and in the description of the *σύνθεσις κοινή* in the *de Compositione* (cited above p. 136).

To conclude therefore: (1) The doctrine of the different styles, whether as presented by Dionysius, or in the more typical formulation of other sources, cannot be referred to Theophrastus on the evidence that he named Thrasyarchus as the author of a mixed style, or more accurately, as the source of the mean (Dionysius Dem. 3). (2) Again it is not an historical development from the Peripatetic triad of the extreme, the deficiency and the mean. (3) The conception of excellence of style of whatever kind as a mean is fundamental to Aristotle's theory and was defined more accurately and illustrated by Theophrastus. From them it passed into the common teaching of ancient rhetoric and finds expression in many forms, especially as the doctrine of *τὸ πρέπον*, and in the definition of a good and a faulty form of each style.

At another time I shall endeavor to indicate the true origin of the threefold classification of style and to interpret its significance.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

¹ The wide difference in the point of view from which the style of Demosthenes is treated in the two works appears strikingly from the fact that in the essay on Demosthenes (ch. 8 init.) Isaeus is named and passed over (with Antiphon, Theodorus, Polycrates, Zoilus, Anaximenes and others of the same time) as having contributed nothing new nor conspicuous to the styles which Thucydides and Lysias, Isocrates and Plato had developed.

II.—ON THE RECESSION OF THE LATIN ACCENT IN CONNECTION WITH MONOSYLLABIC WORDS AND THE TRADITIONAL WORD-ORDER.¹

PART I.

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM.

The present study was originally undertaken with a view to determining the probable cause of the frequent syllable-shortening which occurs in early Latin verse in connection with short monosyllables, i. e. *sed illum*², *sed autem*; in its present form, however, it will be found devoted chiefly to the preliminary task of determining the place of the grammatical accent in the word-groups ∪, ∪ ∪; —, ∪ ∪; and ∪, ∪ ∪ ∪. For it is evident that, after determining the place of the grammatical accent in the flexible tribrach groups *sed ea*, *sed eni(m)*, etc., we shall be in a much better position to determine how far the accents *sēd illum*, *sēd autem* and the like are due to their analogy.

¹ This paper is an extension of a preliminary study on the same subject, an abstract of which appears in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, Vol. XXIII. A study of the accent of the trisyllabic word-groups occurring in Terence has been published by the writer in Transactions Am. Philolog. Assoc. XXXIV (1903), pp. 60-103.

² The scansion of *ille*, *immo*, *quidquid*, *nēquis*, *hocin*, etc., in some other cases as words of two morae, constitutes a wholly distinct problem. Upon this question the general principles laid down by Skutsch must be accepted as final; at the same time Skutsch's conclusions appear to me to call for certain modifications. Thus metrical theory does not require us to assume that a weak final short syllable which is neglected in iambic verse, i. e. *illē*, or a weak medial short syllable which is neglected in anapaestic verse, i. e. *perdidī*, suffers absolute 'apocope' or 'syncope'; it is sufficient to assume that such a syllable was greatly weakened in pronunciation. In general the colloquial iambic poets avail themselves of this license with a definite purpose, viz., in order to preserve unbroken the traditional word-orders, which exist in connection with the sentence-introducing pronouns and conjunctions, i. e. *ille mē*, *unde tū*, etc. A study of the question from this point of view will be published elsewhere, and it will be sufficient to point out here that, just as the existence of *nēmpē* is disproved by the non-occurrence of *nēmpē* with elision, so the existence of *ēquis*, etc., is disproved by the non-occurrence of *ēqu(a)*, *siquē*, etc.

The question of the recession¹ of the accent upon monosyllabic words which are closely connected both in sense and in pronunciation with some following word, is not a new one. Thus Ritschl in the sixteenth chapter of the *Prolegomena*, the chapter entitled 'de Accentu Logico', gives the rule (p. CCLVIII f.) that, so far as regards the accent, an iambic or pyrrhic dissyllable may coalesce with a preceding short monosyllable to form a trisyllabic word, i. e. *pró equo, ét erus, quíd agam*. While Ritschl speaks prevailing in this discussion of metrical coalescence, due to the fact that two short syllables are closely connected in forming a resolved arsis, there can be no doubt, I think, that he means to imply also a real coalescence in ordinary pronunciation. Valuable, however, as is Ritschl's study of this whole question, his treatment must appear to a critical student of the Latin accent at the present day as wanting at times in definiteness and precision. For the critical student must not only consider the question primarily from the view-point of actual coalescence, but must apply the necessary tests to determine the law of the accent in whole series of word-complexes and groups. Ritschl does not attempt to apply such tests, and it is doubtful whether he recognized the operation of a definite law in these processes. True, he not only holds, as has been already noted, that *pró equo, ét erus, quíd agam*, etc., are accented as trisyllabic groups, but he correctly declares (*Proleg.*, p. CCLXI) that the accent of *dé illo, ét iste*, etc., is determined by the same principle, yet upon turning to p. CCLIII of the same chapter of the *Proleg.*, we are perplexed to find a supposed example *set éa* (*Trin. prol. 10: set éã quíd húc*) quoted in illustration of the thesis that monosyllabic particles of trite use and little weight are rightly placed *extra arsim*. If this view were correct, it would appear that the dramatists had known two forms of accentuation in the trisyllabic word-groups in question, viz. *sét eã* and *set éã*, which is far from being the case. For, with a single exception, which is only apparent (*Cap. 329: ut éa-quae*), the 27 cases² occurring in the drama-

¹ For the sake of convenience the term 'recession' is here employed in general of the initial accentuation, $\acute{\text{U}}, \text{U } \text{U}$; $\text{Z}, \text{U } \text{U}$, although it is not in all cases strictly applicable, see below p. 161.

² Viz., *Ba.* 203; 472; *Cap.* 970; 942; *Ci.* 742; *Ep.* 265; 532; *Men.* 186; *Mi.* 346; 686; *Mo.* 160; *Poe.* 1015; 1265; *Ps.* 277; 1087; *Ru.* 1081; *Tri.* 330; 1168; *An.* 337; 837; *He.* 191; 334; *Eu.* 926; *Ph.* 480; 1015; cf. 1046; *Titin. com. fr.* 98; cf. *Att. tr. fr.* 432. Cf. also Seyffert's observation, *Stud. Plaut.*, p. 27 n.,

tists in which *ea*, *id* *et*, *eam* *in* etc., are preceded by a short monosyllable, all show the recessive accentuation *sēt ea*, etc., and the reading *set ēā* quid hūc quoted by Ritschl from Trin. prol. 10 is only an unfortunate conjecture of Bothe's for the MS reading *set ea hūc* quid introferit, just as Fleckeisen makes a similar inadmissible conjecture *sed ēa* servibat, Phorm. 83, for the MS reading *ea serviēbat*.¹ The remarkable uniformity which appears to exist in the accentuation of *sēt ea* and similar groups suggests an inquiry into the general tendencies of the republican accent.

THE REPUBLICAN ACCENT.

There are two periods of the Latin language, the accent-laws of which admit of being reconstructed even in minute detail. The first of these is the republican period, the accents of which are preserved in the dialogue verse of the dramatists; the second is the period of vulgar Latin which gave birth to the Romance languages and has left its accents embedded in the Romance forms. These two periods are separated at their furthest limits by an interval of nearly a thousand years, and the accentual changes which took place within this long period of time are numerous and in some cases far-reaching, yet so slowly is each single change of accentuation effected in the speech of a people² that it seems possible to trace with some precision the history of almost all the important changes in the Latin accent which occurred subsequent to the time of Plautus. According to the views which are held by most accentual scholars the Latin accent rested upon the initial syllable of words and groups until a time shortly before the beginning of the literary period (see the references given by Stolz in Müller's Handbuch II 2, p. 101 ff., 3 Aufl.). Thus in the time of Plautus the initial accent law was already superseded, but its effects were still very distinctly felt;

that the common formula "*quis-hic (hæc)-est?*" is never accented on the second syllable.

¹ Not admissible then are the accents marked by Hauler in his edition of the Phormio: prol. 8 *et ēām*; v. 284 *ita ēūm*, 605 *si ab ēō*.

² Thus in our own language in the case of many words derived from the Latin like *confiscate*, *contemplate*, *demonstrate*, etc., the contest between the Latin accent and the English recessive tendency has been going on since Shakspeare's time and is not yet fully at an end, although in other words of this class, i. e. *obdurate*, *opportune*, *contrary*, *sepulchre*, etc., (Abbott, Shakspearian Grammar, §490) the Latin accent has long disappeared.

we shall best describe the republican accent then as strongly recessive in its nature and as seeking every opportunity of recession within the limits of the three-syllable law. The extreme recession of the accent is shown in three classes of words: I. In the inseparable *composita* which were usually written by the Romans as single words, i. e., *éxplicat, rénégat, cómpater, désuper*, etc. II. In the separable *composita*.¹ Under this head I include first the recession in those separable *composita* which were not infrequently² written by the Romans as single words, or whose parts were sometimes joined together by the *úphév*, i. e., *cale facit, inter esse (intér erit), circum vénit, proptereos, inforo, quamdiu, intereá loci, anté volans, anté tulit* (the last two written with the *úphév* by Donatus, Keil, IV 372, 2 ff.=Schöll, De acc., p. 92; Diomedes, I 434, 36 ff.=Schöll, l. l., p. 95; Max. Vict., VI 193, 28=Schöll, l. l., p. 98); and secondly the recession in those combinations which were only occasionally written together by the Romans, and which can only be called *composita* in the broadest, that is, in the ancient sense of the term; these latter include all the common phrases of the spoken language and also, to a large extent, as we shall see later on, the traditional Latin word-orders, i. e. *sédenim* (Priscian, Keil, III 93, 11f.), *cúrila, quidego, quidea, nétime, nón potest, haúscio, certó scio*, etc. III. In the regular accentuation of quadrisyllabic words beginning with three shorts (◡◡◡◡, proceleusmatic and fourth paeon words) upon the initial syllable, i. e. *fácilius* (cf. Stolz in Müller's Handbuch II 2, p. 101).

¹ For a definition of *composita*, see the *locus classicus* in Priscian, Keil, II 177, 15 ff., and for a discussion of the separable *composita* see Priscian, II 183, 12; III 113, 6; ib. 413, 14. The ancients included all prepositional phrases among the *composita*, as is evident from Charisius I 17, 3; Diom. I 436, 15; Dositheus VII 389, 4; ib. 409, 27, etc.

² This and subsequent references to the Roman system of word-division as extremely fluctuating and uncertain (see, e. g., CIL. I *index*, p. 609 f.) are intentionally made. The practical necessity of adopting—often arbitrarily—a fairly uniform word-division in modern texts of Latin authors obscures for most readers the whole subject of the Latin word-division and of the Latin separable *composita*, and is often misleading even to the critical student. The subject calls for a fuller exposition, but I can only refer here to my brief discussion of the Latin word-division in Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. xxxiv 97-100, and to Eyssenhardt's reproduction, to some extent, of the variable word-division of the MSS in his edition of Martianus Capella (Leipzig, 1866), viz. *et enim* and *etenim, praeter eā* and *praetereā*, etc.

In the Romance languages we find the Latin *composita*, both separable and inseparable, preserved in great abundance, and we observe further that many of the *composita*, which were separable in old Latin appear only as inseparable *composita* in Romance, i. e. Span. *tambien*=Lat. *tam bene* (*tambene*), Span. *tampoco*=Lat. *tam paucum* (*tampaucum*), Span. *ninguno*=Lat. *nec unus* (*necunus*); cf. Corssen, Ausspr. II², p. 890. The coalescence in pronunciation of the more common monosyllables with the following word is regularly indicated also by the writing in literary Italian and by the doubling of the initial consonant of the second word, i. e. *ellui*=*etlui*, *ebbene*=*etbene*, *checcosa*=*quidcausa*, etc. (Meyer-Lübke, Gramm. d. roman. Sprach. I, p. 508). But at this point all similarity ceases; for, as regards the form and accent of the *composita*, the Romance languages, as is well known, proceed from a period of thorough-going 're-composition' ('de-composition'); cf. G. Paris, Rôle de l'accent Lat. dans la langue française, p. 83; Meyer-Lübke, l. l., I, p. 495; Seelmann, Aussprache des Latein, p. 58 ff.; Lindsay, Lat. Lang., p. 199 f.; Stolz, Hist. Gramm. d. lat. Sprache I, p. 188. It is of course not to be denied that single cases of recomposition occur in the oldest literature; thus Stolz, Hist. Gramm. I, p. 187, quotes *expars* Turpilius, cited by Nonius II 138, 29 Müll.; *requaereres* Plaut. Merc. 633; *conquaesivei* CIL. I 551; *conquaesiverit* CIL. I 198, 38 etc., as well as late Latin inscriptional forms like *reddedi* CIL. VI 3, 20029; *condederunt* ib. 18850; but it was only at a very late period and only after a long conflict that these processes of disintegration and recomposition finally prevailed over the earlier tendencies towards composition and recession. Since, then, the Romance forms belong to a period of thorough-going recomposition, they commonly show the fall of the accent in the three classes of words just enumerated: I. In all inseparable *composita* in which the original composition was still felt,¹ i. e., Late Lat. *explicat*, Fr. *exploie*; *renégat*, Ital. *riniega*, O. Fr. *renie*; *compâter*, Fr. *compère*, Span. *compádre*; *desúper*, Fr. *desure*; **ad própe* (in old Latin regularly **ad prope*, like the compound adverbs and prepositions: *dé super*, *in super*, *dé foris*, *á foris*, *ád foras*, *póst modo*; compare, for the last, Servius ad Ecl. I 30), Ital. *apruovo*, O. Fr. *a pruef*; **in fóris*, Ital. *infuori*;

¹ Only in cases where the original composition was no longer felt, was the recessive accent upon the prefix retained, i. e. *collocat*, Fr. *couche*, etc.; cf. G. Paris, l. l., p. 83.

*assátis, Ital. assái, Fr. asséz; **de nóvo* (in old Latin only *dé-nuo*), Fr. de nouveau. II. In almost all the separable *composita*, i. e. Late Lat. *adpédem* (*appédem*), Ital. *appie*; *iamdiu*, Fr. *jadis*; *insinu*, Ital. *insino*; *et béne*, Ital. *ebbene*; *si béne*, Ital. *sebbene*; *tam béne*, Span. *tambien*, etc. III. In the case of words like *facilius* the change from the pro-antepenultimate accent was completed as early as the middle of the second century A. D.¹ In spite of this thorough-going 're-composition,' traces of the old Latin recessive accent have been retained in the Romance languages in the case of a few separable *composita*. Thus the Romance forms derived from the cardinal numerals *viginti*, *triginta*, etc., presuppose a Latin accent upon the antepenult, and are consequently derived, according to d'Ovidio, *Ztschr. f. roman. Philol.* VIII 82 ff. and Skutsch, *Forsch.*, p. 160 ff., from Latin *composita* like *viginti-minae*, *trigintá-dies*, etc.² More direct in its bearing upon the present study is the retention of the recessive accent in the prepositional *composita* *cúm-illa*, *dé illa*, as shown by the Italian *colla*, *della*,³ cf. Corssen, *Ausspr.* II², p. 889 and Skutsch, *Forsch.*, p. 158; it is noteworthy that this accentuation of *cúm-illa* agrees also with those statements of the grammarians (Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 192 f.; Seelmann, *Ausspr.*, p. 41), which show that *dèinde*, *périnde*, etc.,

¹A study of this accentuation which I have made complete for the poets of the empire shows that, after the middle of the second century, the iambic poets completely banished the accent *facilius* from all parts of the verse except the difficult verse-close.

²Here the traditional word-order, in accordance with which the cardinals are usually prefixed to their nouns (v. Delbrück, *Syntakt. Forsch.* III 35, and Schmalz, in Müller's *Handbuch* II³ 2, p. 464) has caused recession of the accent even upon polysyllabic words, i. e., the accent *trigintá* arises whenever the qualified noun is an iambic word, that is, equally in all combinations of numeral and iambic noun, and in the rare *trigintá-manus* as well as in the frequent *trigintá-minas*. In consequence of the extreme frequency of some of these combinations, the accent *triginta* alone is represented in the Romance derivatives.

³By the side of these forms, as Dr. J. E. Shaw has kindly suggested to me, may be placed *alla* and *dalla*, both older combinations than *colla* and *della*. The question is still open with Romance scholars as regards such a derivation as this, or that proposed by d'Ovidio, *A. G. It.* IX 71, n. (cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Z. R. Ph.* XXI 328 f.). On the other hand, the fact that so large a part of the total use of *ego* in the colloquial language consists of its occurrence in word-orders like *et ego* may possibly have something to do with the numerous Romance atonic forms like Span. *yo*, Fr. *je*.

were the common colloquial pronunciations of their time; similarly we find *id illi*, Büch. CLE. 130, 2 in a poetical inscription as late as the year 50 A. D. (v. Bücheler's note), pointing probably to the persistence of the grammatical accent *id- illi*, *ét- illi*, etc. Again the sentence-introducing conjunction *et* became tonic in old Latin in such sequences (traditional word-orders) as *ét-ego*, *ét-ea*, *ét-mihi*, etc. At the present day, to be sure, the Romance languages preserve in general only the atonic forms of *et*, but I owe to the kindness of Prof. C. C. Marden the information that old Spanish has preserved also the tonic forms *ye*, *ie*.¹ Similarly the interrogative, relative and indefinite monosyllabic pronouns, which are usually atonic became tonic in classical Latin in a vast number of sequences, i. e. *quid agis*, *quód agis*, *siquid agis*,² etc.; here the Romance languages have preserved both forms, i. e. tonic

¹See also R. Menéndez Pidal, *Manual elem. de gram. histórica españ.*, Madrid, 1904, p. 212.

²The verse of the dramatists affords the strongest possible evidence of the tonic character of the relative and the indefinite as well as of the interrogative pronouns in these and all similar word-orders. Hence I follow Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 67 (cf. Neue-Wagener, *Formenl.* II³, p. 430) in rejecting absolutely the teaching by which the Latin grammarians attempt, in imitation of the Greek accentual system, to distinguish sharply between the accent of the interrogative and the relative pronouns, attributing the acute invariably to the interrogative and the grave to the relative. As is well-known, the grammarians are not thoroughly consistent here; for while they imitate the Greek distinctions in their statements about the interrogative and relative pronouns, they are by no means agreed in their accounts of the accent of the indefinite pronoun, since Priscian, XIII 3, 13 f., states that the interrogative and the indefinite (!) *qui* have the acute accent, the relative *qui* the grave. While the interrogative pronoun no doubt naturally receives the accent somewhat more frequently than the relative or the indefinite pronoun, a thorough-going distinction in the accent of the several classes cannot reasonably be maintained; see the excellent remarks of Schöll on this question (l. l., p. 67): "Pronuntiatio autem non solum pronominum, sed omnium fere vocabulorum quodam modo immutatur acriusque intenditur in interrogationibus, ut naturae non sit consentaneum hac re propriam quandam pronominum speciem insignire". Cf. also Corssen, *Ausspr.* II², p. 810, on the Latin imitation of the Greek distinctions seen in *ποιός*, *πόσος* and *ποιός*, *ποσός*, etc. Lindsay, *Class. Review* V (1891), p. 402, also speaks somewhat doubtfully of the distinction inculcated by the grammarians. The very acute observations of Weil, *Order of Words*³, Engl. tr., p. 88, have not convinced me that Schöll's argument is inapplicable to the classical languages. The grammarians' ordinary rule is also refuted by Donatus ad Ter. *Hec.* V 4, 25: *Núm quid dixti meo patrí?* *Num aliquid: acuendum ergo quíd.*

Lat. *quēm*, Span. *quien*; atonic *quem*, Span. *que* (cf. Seelmann, Ausspr. d. lat., p. 57); tonic Lat. *quid*, Fr. *quoi*; atonic *quid*, Fr. *que* (cf. Meyer-Lübke, Gramm. d. roman. Sprach. I 506). It may be confidently expected that when the problem presented by the numerous double forms of the pronouns, prepositions and conjunctions in Romance (Meyer-Lübke, l. l., p. 504 ff.) has been more fully solved than is the case at present, still other cases will be noted of the preservation of the old Latin accent. Yet no large number of such examples can be looked for in the Romance languages, and, according to the view which I have sought to present here, the Romance forms, which have arisen a thousand years later, cannot constitute, as is commonly assumed, a source of the first importance for our knowledge of the republican accent or of republican word-forms; far more important here, in my judgment, is a study of those laws of the traditional Latin word-order, which at once determine the accent of word-groups and justify a free metrical treatment of word-forms.

EXTENT OF RECESSION. 'ENCLISIS'.

The present study of the recession of the Latin accent is limited to the case of monosyllabic words; only the dissyllabic prepositions will be included in the discussion. The reason for this restriction lies in the fact that monosyllables are more closely connected in pronunciation with the following word than is commonly the case with longer words; further, certain well-known metrical phenomena point in advance to a coalescence of the monosyllables in pronunciation and the almost total absence of a word-end, viz., formations of the iambic anapaest like *quod amas*, Phorm. 504; *pol eis*, Hec. 788 (cf. Ritschl, Proleg., p. CCXXXVII; Klotz, Grundz., p. 307 f.), and the free occurrence of resolved arses such as *ad eum* venit, Phaedr. I 21, 5; cf. Havet, ed. Phaedr., p. 160; B. Schmidt, De Senecae tragg. rationibus metricis, p. 46 f.; L. Müller, Res Metr.², p. 169.

In general, it is to be noted that a recession of the accent cannot occur apart from some usual word-order. The latter may, however, either be the order of some frequent single phrase, such as *huius-modi*, *interdū-loci*, etc., or it may conceivably be the grammatical or traditional word-order which is observed by all the words belonging to one part of speech in relation to the words belonging to some other part of speech, i. e., 'die tra-

ditionelle Wortstellung' of Delbrück (Syntakt. Forsch. III, 13 ff.; IV, 148 ff.). It is conceivable also that the analogy of phrases and traditional word-orders should in some cases favor a recession of the accent. Wholly exceptional, however, is the peculiar Greek usage which is seen, for example, in the recessive accent of a casual combination like *ἄνθρωπόν τινος*, and which, no doubt, is an extension, through some long-continued process of development, of the original construction *κατὰ σύνεσιν*, which is seen in the case of *ἄνθρωπόν τινα*. I assume for Latin that the accent of iambic words would readily recede whenever these were pronounced in connection with proclitic words, such as the Latin monosyllables can be shown to have been in very large measure, and that under certain conditions iambic words became practically enclitic in Latin. The question may perhaps be asked whether there are not also some formal enclitics in Latin, and whether there are not some cases of recession of the accent due to these. The number, however, of formal enclitics in Latin, i. e., enclitics which, entirely apart from a frequent word-order, throw back an accent upon the preceding word, as may be seen in the Greek *ἄνθρωπόν τινος* and in a hypothetical Latin **regēs enim*, is extremely small, and includes only *que*, *ve*, *ne* and a few similar words;¹ no student of the Latin accent recognizes the existence of many such particles. The term 'enclitic' is, however, properly and frequently applied by Latin scholars to unaccented and weakly accented words. It has long been recognized that many such 'enclitics' occur in the Latin sentence, but the important researches of Wackernagel have made it possible for the first time to determine these words directly from the Latin sentence. Since the word-order which the enclitics observe has a direct bearing upon the problem discussed in this paper, I shall state Wackernagel's conclusions briefly. Delbrück, Syntakt. Forsch. III, pp. 47, 59, 76, first pointed out

¹ Similarly *quidem* when attached to pronouns becomes practically a formal enclitic in consequence of the regular word-order, i. e., *egō-quidem*, *illēquidem*, etc.; see Luchs, Comment. Prosod. I and II. In general, however, the existence of formal enclitics in Latin is to be denied; after monosyllables, to be sure, *ego* has become formally enclitic in locutions like *sed ego*, *quis ego* in consequence of the traditional word-order, but no phenomenon of Plautine verse is known to me, which at present justifies the regularity of such enclisis as **rēgēs ego*, **pātrēs ego*, **āmēm ego*, even when *ego* in these collocations occupies the second position in the sentence; hence in no sense is *ego* a formal enclitic in Latin except in association with monosyllables.

that enclitic, i. e. unaccented words are drawn in Sanskrit by the first word of the sentence, which is apparently the most strongly accented word, "wie von einem Magnet," and this is the case to such an extent that they are regularly found occupying the second position, even when they have no connection in sense with the introductory word. Wackernagel, *Ueber ein Gesetz der indogerm. Wortstellung*, *Indogerm. Forsch.*, I 333 ff., has since greatly extended Delbrück's conclusions by showing with great completeness that the same position-law holds good for many I. E. languages, so that its existence in primitive I. E. is placed beyond all doubt. The Latin orthography, as is well-known, employs no external marks to indicate enclitic word-forms, and consequently no means of determining the Latin enclitic forms was formerly known except through a study of the atonic Romance derivatives, such as the reduction of unaccented *ille* to the Romance article and of the unaccented *me* to Fr. *me*, Ital. *mi*, etc., or through the observance of some special phenomena, such as the avoidance of *atque*¹ and *ille* in the tonic sixth foot of the hexameter (cf. L. Müller, *Res Metr.*, p. 277). Wackernagel's researches seem, however, to supply a direct means of determining the Latin atonics in the precise form in which they existed in the classical age; in any case, it can scarcely be doubted that the old association of the second place in the sentence with accentual weakness is retained to a very large extent in Latin, as has long been recognized in the case of *enim*, *autem*, *vero*, *igitur*, *quoque*, *quidem*, etc. (v. the references given by Wackernagel, l. l., p. 406). Similarly Wackernagel holds, that if the oblique case of a Latin personal or demonstrative pronoun shows precisely the same peculiarities of position as a Greek personal pronoun, whose enclisis is indicated in writing, viz. by gravitating regularly towards the second position, the weak accentual character of the personal or demonstrative pronoun should be considered as established for Latin also. These conclusions, which were reached through a study of the word-order alone, are very notably confirmed in certain cases, as will be shown in detail further on, by the verse-accent of the dramatists; for, if we examine at the beginning of the sentence the extremely sensitive tribrach groups in which the verse-accentuation must correspond to the grammatical accent, i. e. *sēd ēgō*, *sed ea*, *sed ita*, *sed*

¹ On the weak accentual character of the Latin conjunctions in general, see especially the testimony of Audax, Keil, VII, p. 360, 1 ff.

eni(m), *sed eris* etc., it appears at once that the initial accent alone was known in these groups to the republican dramatists, and that the second word is here unaccented, i. e. *séd ego*, *séd eris*, etc. The case of dactylic groups at the beginning of the sentence, such as *sed mihi*, *atque ita*, *non ita*, is somewhat different, since they are far less sensitive material for accentual investigation and do not admit here the same metrical test; yet it can scarcely be doubted that they were also accented similarly to a large extent in the spoken language. It should be pointed out, however, in conclusion that the only definite relation which the recessive accents *séd ego*, *séd ea*, *séd mihi* bear to Wackernagel's law, consists in the traditional I. E. word-order which the Latin has here preserved; the Latin accent, which results of course from the word-order, conforms in every case to the Latin system of accentuation, i. e. *id enim* (monosyllable), but more often *rêges enim* (dissyllable) in a non-rhythmical sequence.

SEPARABLE COMPOSITA.

It is not surprising to find that the separable character of many of the Latin *composita* and the consequent free use of tmesis-forms attracted the attention of grammarians even in ancient times and called forth conflicting definitions of 'composition' (Priscian, Keil, III, p. 113, 6; ib. 413, 14; II 183, 12 vs. Orthogr. Bern. II, Keil, Supplement., p. 296, 8; 295, 29). The view here adopted by Priscian, viz., that combinations like *respublica*, *nullomodo*, *nihilominus*, etc., are *composita*, in spite of the occasional separation of their component parts, is undoubtedly correct upon the whole, yet a real solution of the problem is given only by the use of the historical method and by a study of the various stages through which the word-group passes in the course of its development. In accordance with this method, Leo (Nachr. d. Göttinger Ges., phil.-hist. Kl., 1895, p. 415 ff.) has thoroughly examined a number of Plautine word-groups and clearly set forth the essential principles which regulate their use. The subject still admits of further investigation in matters of detail, but a brief summary, of a somewhat more general character than Leo's discussion, will alone be possible here. In the first place, it may be observed that the use of tmesis-forms was formerly very imperfectly understood, and that it is the especial merit of Wackernagel's investigations to have formulated

clearly one of the chief conditions under which they freely occur, viz., the weakly accented conjunctions, pronouns and particles, in their struggle to occupy the traditional second position, long retain the power of freely dividing the *composita* which have otherwise grown into a unity, e. g., Festus 309^a, 30 M. *sub vos placo*; Cic. Off. 3, 104 *ius igitur iurandum*. Secondly, although in our modern terminology we often find it convenient on practical grounds to distinguish more or less sharply between word-groups or phrases and genuine compounds, no clear line of distinction can be drawn between the two classes; see Lindsay, Lat. Lang., p. 361 ff.; Stolz, Hist. Gramm. d. lat. Sprach. I, p. 404 ff.; Paul, Principles of Language,² Engl. transl., p. 371 ff. The difficulty of distinguishing sharply between genuine and separable compounds may be said to reach its maximum in the verbs compounded with *ante*, *circum*, *contra*, *post*, *praeter*, *propter*(?), *subter* and *super*, which exhibit no clear mark of composition in vowel change and at the same time readily undergo tmesis; they are also especially variable in respect to punctuation in MSS and Inscr., and it is evident that the grammarians were far from being agreed as to how they should be punctuated; see Marius Victorinus, Keil, VI 23, 7 ff., cf. also Quintil. I 5, 68. With respect to their accentuation, however, it is clear both from the statements of the grammarians and the verse of the iambic and dactylic poets that they were always treated as *composita*, i. e. *int̄r erit* (cf. *int̄r eos*), *sup̄r erit*, *circūm dedit*¹, *ant̄ volans*, *ant̄ venit* (for the use of the hyphen, see above, p. 150). Again, it is clearly impossible to draw sharp distinctions in this field, when we consider the case of those *composita*, which were often separated in early Latin—most frequently through the influence of toneless words²—, but at a later period lost either entirely or almost entirely the power of being thus freely treated. Among *composita* of this kind belong *consue facere*, *are facere*, *perferve facere*, etc. (examples in Stolz, Hist. Gramm. I, p. 435), *fabre facere*, *lucri facere*, *manu emittere*, *animum advertere*, *super esse* (always freely

¹ Thus hexameter closes like Verg. Aen. VIII 474, *circūmsonat armis*, are frequent.

² Second only to the influence of toneless words in producing tmesis-forms must be placed the metrical necessity of finding always an iambus for the closing foot; see, e. g., Seyffert, Berl. Phil. Wochenschr. 1888, p. 237; Nilsson, Quomodo pronomina ap. Pl. collocentur, Lund, 1901, p. 9; Asmus, De appositionis ap. Pl. collocat., pp. 26–34.

separable), *male facere, bene facere*, etc., *palam facere, magnopere, sacro sanctus, ius iurandum, qua propter, propter ea* (for the reversed order *ea propter*, v. Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre I 676), *tam quam, quo minus, nihilo minus, at tamen, at qui, nescioquis, quid ni*, or *quinni* (examples in Brix-Niemeyer, Mil. 1120), *quippe ni (quippini), quomodo, persaepe, quicumque*, etc.¹ E. g. Amph. 815 *qua istaec propter*; Curc. 85 *super illi fuerit*; Cas. prol. 21 *opere magno* (other examples in Neue-Wagener, Formenl. II 607 f.) Amph. prol. 84 *quive alter quo placeret fecisset minus*; Rud. 946 *at pol qui audies*; Aul. 71 *nescio pol quae . . . intemperiae*; Cas. 370 *per pol saepe peccas*; Pers. 210 *quoi pol quomque*, etc.

In conclusion I am far from denying that the modern distinction between proper and improper compounds is in some cases a valuable one, yet it is necessary to add that the number of improper compounds and word-groups in Latin is much greater and the number of proper compounds much smaller than is commonly supposed; it may even be doubted whether the latter class includes forms like *detorquet* and *peragit*, which even in the Augustan poets sometimes exhibit a species of tmesis, which is produced by the verse-caesura² and perceptible to the ear alone (L. Müller, Res Metr.², p. 458 ff.). Hence for the purposes of the present study, which freely employs the ancient terminology and has the accent chiefly in view, *sed enim* (Priscian, Keil, III 93, 11 f.), *inforo, quid ego, quid ea*, etc., are to be regarded as separable or improper *composita* in the same sense as *circum dare, are facere, huiuscê modi*, etc.; for it is undeniable that in actual use these phrases have often come to denote a single concept, as Priscian's definition requires (Keil, II 177, 15 ff.), i. e. *sed enim* = *sed*, *quid ego* = *quid*, while with *inforo* we may compare the English word-complexes *indoors, downstairs*, and the American *downtown*; see other examples in Paul, l. l., p. 367 ff. So far, however, as concerns purely scientific results, it is far better to discard entirely the conventional terminology, and to base the study of the accent not at all upon 'composition', but wholly upon the traditional word-order.

¹ For a detailed study of several of these combinations, see Leo, l. l., p. 417 ff.

² Upon this frequent 'caesura by tmesis', see also Plessis, Métrique § 29, 2°.

ACCENT OF MONOSYLLABLES.

We learn from the repeated statements of the Latin grammarians that the prepositive monosyllables are as a rule (*fere*) atonic (Priscian, Keil, III 479, 20, etc.). In a former discussion of this question (Transactions Am. Phil. Assoc., XXXIV, p. 62 f.) I interpreted the rule of the grammarians to mean that the monosyllabic prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns and adverbs are atonic *per se*, that is, naturally or originally atonic, i. e. *quam bene*, *quo minus*, and that they can acquire an accent only through recession, i. e. *quám-bene*, *quó-minus*. It is quite unnecessary, however, as I now think, to assume in this way the truth of an abstract proposition, such as the necessary or original atonic character of the monosyllables. It seems simpler and more reasonable, as well as more thoroughly in accord with the usage of other languages, to proceed from the assumption that the monosyllabic particles, *quam*, *iam*, *et*, etc., like all other independent words, have originally an accent, as in fact the grammarians expressly declare; if they very frequently lose this accent, this happens simply because they are subordinated in sense to the other words of the sentence and, at the same time, in the majority of cases, cannot preserve their accent through the operation of the three-syllable law; for it is certain that combinations like *quam mágnus*, *quam máxime*, *et sentit* have as a rule only a single accent. Similarly it can scarcely be doubted that examples in which the second word is an iambus or a pyrrhic, i. e. *quam bene*, *et magis*, cf. *neque potest*, *neque scio*, have commonly no place for two separate accents in the rapid legato pronunciation of common life, which does not especially aim at the painful spelling out of single words or the precise placing of theoretical stresses.¹ The question remains whether in the examples just cited the accent falls on the monosyllable or on the principal word; it will probably be correct to conclude here that both accents are equally correct and equally legitimate, that is, *quám bene*, *ét magis*, cf. *néque potest*, are as normal as *quam béne*, *et mágis*, cf. *neque pótest*, and there seems no reason to suppose that in fugitive collocations such as these, which are not included under any of the traditional word-orders, either

¹ Compare the warning, for example, in Gramm. Lat., Suppl., p. 228, 33 H. (= Schöll, De acc., p. 128) against pronouncing *male sanus* with two accents, i. e. *mále sánus*, instead of *malesánus*.

accentuation ever prevailed to the complete exclusion of the other, except in the later period when the recessive tendency was lost and the disinclination to place the accent upon a prefix became fully established. In all other periods the choice between the two accentuations is doubtless dependent chiefly upon the general rhythm or melody of the sentence, i. e. upon the sentence-accent.¹ The existence of the initial accent, however, even in the case of casual combinations like *quám bene, ét magis*, is very clearly shown by their free admission in those feet of Latin verse which conventionally require a tonic syllable to be placed in the arsis, viz. the third foot of the trimeter, the fifth foot of the hexameter and the first foot of the Adonic, while Cicero's well-known story (De div. II 84) of *cáve n[e] eas*² pronounced nearly as *caíneas* points to the same conclusion. According to this view, in examples like those just cited, which show the accentuations *ét magis* and *et mágis* existing apparently side by side, we cannot admit, strictly speaking, that any 'recession' of the accent has occurred in the case of *ét magis*, but must consider the latter in every way an original accent; we can only say that the recessive nature of the Latin accent renders two accents, i. e. *ét mágis* (cf. *nêque pólest*) quite unnecessary in such combinations. The term 'recession' in its proper sense is rather to be applied to the very numerous cases of phrases and word-orders, in which the initial accent has entirely superseded the medial and alone remains in use, i. e. *haúscio, id scio, idagit*, etc.; since, however, 'recession' is the most convenient term to employ, on account of its brevity, I shall continue to use it of the former class of cases also, and content myself with pointing out that this use is in reality inexact.³

¹ English and Latin monosyllables have many points of similarity in respect to their variable accentuation. For while dissyllables and polysyllables always have a fixed accent in English, our monosyllables are treated in each case either as accented or unaccented according to the choice of the poet; cf. Dabney, *Musical Basis of Verse*, p. 32.

² According to Skutsch, *Forsch.*, p. 58, = *cauí n[e] eas*.

³ A collection of additional facts, bearing upon the coalescence of the Latin monosyllables in pronunciation and upon the Latin system of word-division, is omitted here from considerations of brevity. Besides the frequent writing of monosyllables together with the following word in *Inscr.* (Corssen, *Ausspr.* II² 868 ff.) and *MSS* (Wattenbach, *Lat. Palaeogr.*³, p. 76; Lindsay, *Lat. Text. Emendation*, p. 14), the approval of this custom by the grammarians (Marius Victor., Keil, VI, 23, 7 ff.) and its retention in the writing

of many phrases of modern Italian, which involve the prepositions and the sentence-introducing conjunctions (see above, p. 151), it will be sufficient here to refer to Bährens, *praef. Poet. Lat. min.*, I, p. XII, and to L. Müller, *Res Metr.*³, p. 579, for the treatment of '*in arca*' (v. 5), '*ut vere*' (11) '*ego sum*' (10: enclisis of the substantive verb) as single words of six letters each in the ingeniously constructed verses of the *carmina duodecim sapientium* (Bährens, IV, p. 120f.). Two monosyllables are often similarly treated, as *aes est* (*ibid.*, v. 5); for *iamnunc* and *sivis* similarly counted as single words, v. L. Müller, l. l., p. 581. The effect of the traditional word-order, in causing the combination of monosyllabic conjunction and pronoun to be felt as a single word, is further seen in the following: *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* IV, 22, 4 *astilla verum illa femininum est*; *ib.* IV 480, 18. Similar is the statement of the grammarians that a conjunction, like *at* (*ad*), may be 'prefixed' to any case of a noun or to any verb, while a preposition, like *ad* (*at*), can commonly be 'prefixed' to one case of a noun only or to a verb through composition (*Prisc.*, K. III 25, 24 f.; *Audax VII* 351, 17 f.; *Suppl. LI*). Thus we apparently have a play upon the two uses of the prefixed *ad* or *at* in *Poe.* 544:

At trepidate sáltem: nam vos *ad*properare haud póstulo,

i. e., *at—saltem* (like *at—tamen*) and *adproperare*. The editors commonly correct to *attrepidate*, which seems unnecessary.—Again the close connection between the monosyllable and the following word in pronunciation is indicated by the complaint of Consentius (*Keil*, V 395, 7) that in the pronunciation of some *sic ludit* was indistinguishable from *si cludit*. As is well known (*Lindsay*, L. L., pp. 122, 215), the monosyllables **cord*, **terr*, **ess*, *med*, *ted*, *hisc(e)*, *hosc(e)*, etc., long retained their final consonant in early Latin before an initial vowel, while *haud* (*Caper*, K. VII 96, 4) and **hocc* (*Velius Longus*, K. VII 54, 6) never lost the final consonant in this position, e. g. '*hocc erat*, *alma parens*'; *CIL.* IX 60, 3 terminus *hicc est*. Cf. also *Skutsch*, *Forsch.*, p. 60 f.

ELMIRA, N. Y.

R. S. RADFORD.

III.—STUDIES IN ETYMOLOGY, II.

In KZ. 36, 103 Pedersen presents a brief and interesting discussion of the phenomenon of Greek ζ = Skr. *y-* and Latin *j-*. In place of the usual transcription for the primitive Aryan speech of spirant *j-* and semivowel *i* (the latter for cases where the spiritus asper stands in Greek, e. g. in ἡπαρ: Skr. *yákr̥t-*, Latin *jecur*) he favorably considers Havet's transcription by *ii* and *i*, respectively; and makes the suggestion, exempli causa, that *ii* is a reduction of *ḡi*, noting that this initial group has not been found, though *ḡi* and *ḡhi* are attested, the latter by Skr. *hyás*, Gr. *χθίς* 'yesterday' (cf. Latin *heri*, without trace of the *i*). In the history of the Germanic dialects, on the other hand, *-yy-* gave rise variously to *-ddy-* (Gothic) and *-ggy-* (Old Norse). In this paper I shall use *y* for *i*, and the Old English guttural spirant *ȝ* for *j*.

The examples for the phenomenon under discussion, extracted from Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* § 115, are, so far as Latin is concerned, the following: ζυγόν, Skr. *yugám*, Lat. *jugum* 'yoke', with their verb systems; ζύμη 'leaven', Skr. *yūṣam* 'soup', Lat. *jūs*. True, objection to the latter cognation has been raised of late by Bally (*Mém. Soc. Ling.* 12, 314), on semantic grounds, viz.: that ζύμη 'leaven' was alien in signification to the other words, which mean 'soup', but this objection seems to me irrelevant as long as Latin *fermentum* 'leaven' comes from *fervet* 'boils', while French *bouillon* 'soup' similarly comes from *bouillir* 'to boil'.

The above examples show of course that *j-* in certain Latin words corresponds to ζ- in Greek¹ and to *y-* in Sanskrit, but they are valid only for the equation of Latin *ju-* = Greek ζ- = Skr. *yū-*, and do not further prove that Latin *je-*, say, would be the normal correspondent for Gr. ζ- Skr. *ya-*.

¹ I cannot doubt but that this ζ- is in some cases the product of *DY-*, e. g., in ζυγόν 'yoke' and ζωστής 'belted', both ultimately cognate, I take it, with *dēu* binds, Skr. *dy-dti*, from a root *DĒ(Y)*. With a Sanskrit pair *sydti* 'binds': *syā-ma* 'band', we might infer beside *dy-dti* 'binds', a **dyū-ma*, cognate with Skr. *yāuti* 'binds', with lost initial *d-*. Projecting this conclusion back on the primitive period we get a base (D)YEW-.

For all we know, primitive *ge-* may have had a different history in Latin from *gu-*, just as in Old English the normal representation of primitive *gu-* and *yu-* is *iu-*, but primitive *ge-* and *ye-* yield *ge-* (cf. Sievers-Cook, Old English Grammar, § 175).

These considerations lead me to propose the following etymologies, in which Gr. *ze-* and Skr. *ya-* will correspond to Latin *ge-*.

(1) Lat. *gemi* 'twins', Skr. *yamás* 'coupled', Old Irish *emuin* 'gemini', from a Celtic stem **jemno-s*.

(2) Lat. *gestit* 'desires eagerly, burns' [cf. *fervet* 'boils, desires eagerly'; *furit* 'boils (Aeneid, i. 107), desires eagerly' (Horace, Carm. i. 15, 27)], Skr. *yádyati* 'becomes hot, (boils), exerts oneself, strives'. For the semantic chain, cf. also Old Bulg. *kypěti* 'to seethe', Skr. *kúpyati* 'is angry', Latin *cupit* 'desires'.

If these etymologies are to be rejected, and *gemi*: *yamás*, in spite of Weber's advocacy, has long been rejected, it will not be because the words in question show any incompatibility on the side of their signification.

If the proposition that Latin *ge-* represents primitive *ze-* should arouse in our minds the hostility of surprise, this hostility may perhaps be dispelled by noting, in addition to the Old English analogies mentioned above, that the reduction of *gye-* (I speak now in the terms of Pedersen's hypothesis) to Latin *ge-* may be compared with the equivalence of Latin *he-* (in *heri*) with Skr. *hya-* in *hyás* (cf. Gr. *χθής*: primitive **g̑hyes*, **g̑yhes*).

Difficulties still remain, however, for solution. Latin *aemulus* 'rival' and *imitatur* 'rivals, imitates' have been paired with Skr. *yamás*; *aemulus* being by some, e. g. Uhlenbeck, ai. Woert., s. v. *yamás* (cf. Hirt, Ablaut No. 654), explained from a base *ayem-*: while Thurneysen (KZ. 32, 566), who has meantime omitted his explanation from the Thesaurus, derived it from **ad-yemolos*. But the cognation of *aemulus* and *imitor* with Skr. *yamás* is so far from simple that there would be little room to hesitate about preferring the cognation I am defending between *gemi* and *yamás*, if this were all. On the other hand, *gemi* has been compared with Skr. *vi-jāman-* 'related, corresponding', *jāmis* 'leiblich verschwistert', and Thurneysen (l. c., footnote) would find in *gemi* a contamination of both these derivations, that is, make it akin to both *yamás* and *jāmis*. Inasmuch as English *kin* is so apt a translation for both *vi-jāman-* and *jāmis* I cannot bring myself to separate this pair of words, *-jā-man-* and *jā-mis*

(with suffixal *m*), from the root *jan* and from Avestan *zāmi*, 'posterity, children' (cf. German *kinder*, English *kin*, both cognates of this root). This consideration leaves the preference for Old Ir. *emuin* = Latin *gemini*: *yamás*, always provided that Latin *ge-* be proved the equivalent of Skr. *ya-*, Gr. *ζει-*. The second etymology suggested, viz. *gestit*, Skr. *yásyati*, Gr. *ζειν* ('boils, boils with passion'), though giving room for no valid objection on the semantic side, calls for an account on the morphological side why *-t-* has been added to *ges-*. In view of the narrow range of the *-te-* suffix in Latin verb inflexion (but cf. Feist's explanation of *sentire* in his *Gotische Etym.* No. 495; and now Brugmann in *I. F.*, 15, 76), we should perhaps explain the *-t-* of *gestire* as left over from an iterative inflection, *gestare*, attracted to the flexional type of the synonymous verb *cupire*; cf. the double inflexion of the verb concretely synonymous with *gestire*, viz. *bullare*, *bullire*, 'to bubble, boil'.

(3) *gerit* 'raises, bears'. An obvious objection would be felt to the separation of *gestit* from *gerit*. But after all, does our explanation of *gestit* separate it from *gerit* any more than the two already lie apart in point of meaning? A satisfactory etymology of *gerit* still halts (not Osthoff's [*a*]g-es-, at any rate).

I cannot satisfy myself with the derivation of *gestit*,—which exhibits but two senses (1) 'desires, cupit' (2) 'is eager, fervet',—from the noun *gestus*,¹ with the signification of 'gesticulates'.² It is just as impossible, starting with *gestit* 'cupit, fervet' to account for *gerit* with the signification of 'bears, carries', etc. But it is open to us, by mediating between the two, to try and derive *gerit* and *gestit* from a common source.³

I take it that *ζειν* 'boils' exhibits, not a primary, but a secondary sense of the root *-ges-*. The Germanic cognates (most con-

¹ This difficulty touches the meaning, not the form, as *artire* 'to joint' stands beside *artus* 'a joint'. Otto (in *I. F.* 15, 25 sq.) supposes that derivatives in *-tire* and *-täre* stood freely beside one another, setting up, e. g. a type **captire/captäre* [?contaminated in low Latin **captiare*, whence French *chasser*], for which he cites only *artire*, later *artäre*, as an actual authentication: a better pair were the coeval *gestire/gestäre*, both kept alive because of their different meaning.

² Pace Sittl, *die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*, p. 10. In a passage like Plautus, *Bacch.* 596, *ita dentifrangibula haec meis manibus gestiunt*, 'heaving' is an interpretation as apt as 'gesticulating'.

³ Cf. the approximate semantic parallel in Lith. *grėbiù* 'rapio': Lett. *gribēt* 'velle'.

veniently examined in Kluge's Etym. Woert. s. v. *gären*) mean 'to ferment, foam'; among these are German *gischt*, English *yeast*, cf., for the signification, English 'leaven', colloquial 'rising', and German 'die hefen', all of which suggest that the bubbling of boiling and fermentation may have got its name from a verb meaning 'to raise' (trans.), 'rise' (intrans.). With a primary notion of heat in this verb we have nothing to do, any more than in Latin *bullit* 'bubbles'. Traces of the sense 'raises, lifts' are not altogether absent in derivatives of *gerit*, for instance in *agger* 'mound', *congestus* 'pile', *suggestus* 'platform'; perhaps also the ancient phrase *re bene gesta* (Persa, 754, and often) meant originally much the same thing as *praedam tollere* 'to lift plunder'. It is very easy, if we start with 'lifts' as the primary notion of *gerit*, to account for its subsequent development as a synonym of *fert* 'bears', for the perfect of *fert* is *tulit*, which means precisely 'lifts'.

It happens very appositely that the development of significations here assumed is of record in the Germanic languages in the history of the verb *heben*—and here I will follow closely Paul's Deutsches Woerterbuch, s. v. *heben*—which seems originally to have signified 'to grasp, seize' but already in primitive Germanic exhibited the general sense of (1) 'lifts, raises'; specialized in (2) English *heaves*, used of 'the bubbling and boiling of the swollen sea'; and in (3) German *die Hefen*, a word for 'leaven, rising'. A corresponding classification of the progeny of primitive *ges-* yields (1) Lat. *gerit* 'lifts, raises, bears'; (2) Gr. *ζειν* 'heaves, boils, bubbles', corresponding, in little, to the usage cited for English *heaves*,—and so, in the figurative use only, does Lat. *gestit* 'fervet, cupit'; (3) English *yeast* 'die Hefen'. Old High German *jesan* 'to ferment, foam' and *yeasty* in the phrase "yeasty wave" show the close relation of (3) and (2), while *yeasty* in "yeasty spirit" suggests Latin *gestit*.¹

(4) *gemma*, *germen*, 'bud, sprout, button (of a plant)'; *gisma* 'annulus'. The derivation of this pair of words from primitive

¹I permit myself a passing suggestion to the effect that the *g-* of *gären* and *gisch* may constitute for German also a record of a difference between the history of primitive *Ze-* and *ye-*, if we might assume that the *j-* which is recorded in the older Germanic forms was an inexact orthography for a sound that was neither a guttural spirant (*ʒ*) nor a semivowel (*y*) precisely, but a *tertium quid* whose earlier orthography with *j-* was quasi rectified by another approximation with *g-*.

Italic *gesma* and **gesimen* is phonetically sound, and it seems plausible to derive them from the same root. If we are right in defining *gerit* by 'raises', then *gemma* and *germen* mean 'a rising, swelling'—or in the language of dictionaries—'a protuberance on a plant'. The same metaphor is seen in the phrase 'the buds swell'; and in French *bouton*, German *knopf*, *knospe*, 'bud, button' etc. Or the connection of sense might be made directly with the root *ges-* 'bubbles, boils', defining *gemma* by 'knob, stud, bulla' (: *bullat*, *bullit*).

Of course there are other explanations current for *gemma* (see Stolz, Lat. Gramm. p. 88) but a certain attest might seem of record for **gesma* in the glosses (see Goetz's Thesaurus, s. vv.) *anulus* 'gisma' and *gisma* 'angulus', *gemma* in the sense of 'signet-ring' being well known. The glosses have preserved *dusmum* also for *dumum*.

(5) *gerro*: *congerro* 'trifler, idle fellow'; 'a jolly companion, playfellow'; *gerrae* 'nonsense' (i. e. 'frothing'). Greek *φλύει* is rendered by 'boils over, bubbles up, chatters', and *φλύει* has much the same meanings. This makes me raise the query whether Latin *gerrae* is, after all, borrowed from the Greek, according to the engaging story reported by Festus, cited in our lexica and defended, with not altogether satisfactory semantic readjustment, by Sonny in Archiv, 10, 377. This entire Sicilian tale may be but a bit of ancient etymologizing, for ancient etymology was quite capable of combining *GERRAE* with *CRATES*, or with Greek *γέρον*, and of inventing a tale to back up the etymology. The way seems open therefore to derive *gerrae* 'nonsense' from **geserae*, a formative type related to the root *ges* of *ζει* 'boils' as Skr. *iṣirā-s* (cf. Gr. *ιρός*, Doric *ιρός*) is related to the root *iṣ-*. The form *gerro* would be secondary to *gerrae*, just as that Plautine soul, Appuleius, fashioned a *nugo* to *nugae*, cf. the gloss of Placidus, *gerro* 'nugator dictus a gerris'. The alleged cognation of *gerro* with Hesychian *γράφων* 'μωρέ, ἀνούστατε' presents difficulties, and *γράφων* (for **γραφων*) may well be cognate with Lat. *garrit* 'chatters'.

(6) *gemit* 'sighs, groans'.

I am not prepared to pronounce the cognation of *gemit* and Gr. *γέμει* 'is full of' entirely unsatisfactory on semantic grounds, but the problem of correlating the meaning of these words is difficult, I submit. It may accordingly be worth while to note our English idiom *heaves a sigh*, and German *Seufzer heben die*

Brust. In view of the obvious physical character of the sigh, which these locutions attest, the phrase *heaves a sigh* is very like the psychological phenomenon to which grammarians have given the name of *figura etymologica*; cf. also in French the locution *pousser des soupirs* (*gémissements*) 'to heave sighs (groans)'. In English *heave* is specialized as a noun in the sense of 'an impulse to vomit', and in veterinary medicine *heaves* is the 'panting respiration of a porsy horse'; in French such a horse is *un cheval poussif, qui pousse*. Accordingly we might define Latin *gemit* by 'heaves (sc. a sigh)', intransitive, as *heaves* 'has an impulse to vomit' is intransitive. This definition admits of our connecting *gemit* with Skr. *yámati* 'heaves, raises, holds.' Note Truc. 599, *me intuetur gemens* ('heaving'), | *traxit* ('having fetched') *ex intumo uentre suspirum*.

In view of the secondary definition of Sanskrit $\sqrt{yam-}$, chiefly in the flexional type *yácchati*, by 'offers, presents, gives', it is interesting to note that Luther used *hebe* of an 'offering' to God (cf. English 'heave offering'), and *heben* for 'to offer'.

The cognation of *gemit* with Skr. *yámati* is not in conflict with the cognation, not certainly correct, of $\eta\eta\iota\alpha$ and *yámati* (cf. Prellwitz and Uhlenbeck in their lexica, s. vv.), since we may write $\ast\eta\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ as the primitive form for *gemit* and *yámati*.

(7) *Gemoniae, gemiones, gemursa, etc.*

Executed criminals at Rome were dragged up-stairs from the Tullianum and exposed upon a place called *Gemoniae*, popularly interpreted as the 'sighing' place. Popular etymology may in this case be authentic, but our somewhat vague information lets us wonder if the *Gemoniae* was not an elevated framework, a sort of stocks or shambles, cognate with Skr. *yan-trám* 'Schránke'; or if *Gemoniae* is, more vaguely, a general place of insult and torture, we might compare *yan-trin-* 'torturer'; *yan-trám* and *yan-trin* both derive from *yámati*. The former definition, quasi 'barrier', seems to be borne out by the gloss *gemiones* 'mac(h)eriae' (= 'enclosures, walls').

The ancient word *gemursa* 'swelling, rising under the toe' might be regarded either as a cognate of Skr. *yámati* 'raises' or, if derived from *ge(m)múrsa*, of *gisma, gemma*, as explained above.

The glossic words *gemina* 'peristromata' ('coverings') and *geminiscus* 'καπρόδεσμος, ligatura brachiorum febrientibus' (= 'bandage'), though of possible primitive derivation from the

root of Skr. *yámati* 'binds', are liable to explanation as of secondary Latin origin: in connection with *gemina* we might think of our own phrase 'double blankets', and *geminiscus* we might define by 'coupler'; besides, *geminiscus* is near enough like its Greek synonym *λημνίσκος* to owe its origin to a scribe's mistake.

To recapitulate: in order to reconcile Skr. *yamá-s* 'coupled', O. IR. *emuin* 'twins' (from Celtic **jemnos*) with Lat. *gemi*ní 'twins', we lay down the hypothesis that Lat. *ge-*, Skr. *ya-* (Gr. *ζε-*) derive from Aryan *ǵe-* (*ǵē-*, *ye-*). The evidence to confirm this is furnished, A. by Lat. *gemit* 'heaves (a sigh)': Skr. *yámati* 'heaves'; (possible cognates of the same root are *Gemoniae*, if meaning something like 'framework', and *gemiones* 'macherae'); B. by sundry Latin cognates of the Aryan root *ǵes-* 'to heave' (Gr. *ζειν* 'fervet', Skr. *yásyati*, *yéṣati* 'fervet, iurit'), to wit: (1) *gestit* 'fervet, cupit'; (2) *gerit* 'heaves'; (3) *gemma*, *germen* 'swelling, protuberance, bud' (cf. *gisma* = *gemma* 'signet ring'); (4?) *gerrae* (from **geserae*) 'froth, nonsense'.

To the equation in A. I attach no strong evidential value. The etymologies in B. seem to me of some cogency, though in varying degrees, certainly of a cogency strongly to confirm the cogent premiss, Latin *gemi*ní = O. Ir. *emuin* 'twins': Skr. *yámá-s* 'coupled'.

(8) *per-ierat* 'forsewars': *iūrat* 'swears'.

The only positive appeal against the recognition of *ǵes-* in the Latin words cited under B. must come from those persons, if there are any, who accept the validity of Brugmann's attempt (I. F. 12, 396 fg.) to explain Lat. *per-ierat* 'swears falsely' as a cognate of Gr. *ζειν* 'boils' and Skr. *yásyati* 'ardet'.

On semantic grounds alone this explanation of *perierat* is entirely out of court, and the old explanation is capable of phonetic defence, a defence that has already been rendered in part. Warren (in Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., 32, 110 fg.) has noted that *iūrat* 'swears' (from **iovesat*) would suffer in compounds a phonetic development different to the history of the simplex. Starting from **per-iouesat*, he reduces it to *periuerat* (*periuera*) and, relying on dialectic forms like Febrarius for Februarius (Februarius?) justifies the loss of *u* in the heavy consonant group. This phonetic history appears to me possible, but not proved, inasmuch as *-riū-* is susceptible to other simplifications. Instead of reducing the *-ou-* of *-iouplesat* to *u*

(v), it seems to me we should rather reduce its *-io-* to *i*. I can, to be sure, cite no other case of this precise reduction, which is scarcely to be wondered at in view of the small number of Latin words with initial *io-*. For suffixal *io/i* we might cite *alius/alis*, *gratia/grates*, but there is more than one plausible explanation for the shift *io/i* in suffixes. Resting, however, on the analogy of the compounding form of *iacit* (viz. *-icit*),¹ and on the evidence of *bigae* (from **bi-iugae*) we may safely suppose that **per-ioverat* would have been reduced to *periverat*. The *v* of *periverat* might optionally fall away as in all the perfect verb forms with *-ive-*, leaving *perierat* which, for all that the metres attest, may everywhere be read *pēri(v)erat* in Plautus. Not only so, but Plautus MSS show *periūrat* where the metre demands *perierat*, and if *peri(v)erat* be restored it enables us readily to account, on purely palaeographical grounds, for the unmetrical reading *periūrat*. On this we cannot insist, however, for *periūrat* as a 'recomposed' form might naturally slip into the place of *pērierat*. But *peri(v)erat* may be read in every place where the metre demands *periūrat* as well as where it demands *pērierat*, and it is not unlikely, however insusceptible to demonstration, that Plautus knew only *peri(v)erare*, not both *pērierare* and *periūrare*. The subsequent reduction of *peri(v)erare* to *perjerare* proceeds on normal lines of sound change (cf. Brugmann, Gr. i,² § 251).

A pun between *perire* and *perieret* seems to lurk in the following passage, if we bear in mind how Plautus continually rings the changes on *perdere/perire* (e. g. in Bacch. 1015, si plus *perdundum* sit, *periisse* suavius),

Bacch. 1028 ego ius iurandum verbis conceptis dedi,
daturum id me hodie mulieri ante vesperum,
priusquam a me abiret. nunc, pater, ne *perierem*
cura. * * *

1039 verum, ut ego opinor, si ego in istoc sim loco
dem potius aurum quam illum *corrumpi* sinam.
duae condiciones sunt: utram tu accipias vide:
vel ut aurum *perdas* vel ut amator *perieret*.

(9) *aemulatur* 'sequitur'.

The cognation of Lat. *gemi* 'twins' with Skr. *yamá-s* 'coupled', as maintained above, would seem little probable if the connection of *yamá-s* with Lat. *aemulatur*, defined, for etymological purposes, by 'sucht gleich zu kommen' (cf. Uhlenbeck, got.

¹ Metrifications like *cōnicit* are due to 'recomposition'.

Woert. s. v. *ibns*, and Hirt, Ablaut, No. 654) is right, both being derived from a dissyllabic root *ayem-*.¹ But if we get a satisfactory account of *yamás* by defining it 'coupled, paired, a brace' (: *yámati* 'binds') there is no very good ground for connecting it with Lat. *imago* 'picture', Goth. *ibns* (English *even*) whose primary meaning lies uncertain between 'level' and 'equal' (cf. the Oxford Dict. s. v. *even*).

If we record a verdict of non liquet against *aemulatur*: Skr. *yamás*, Goth. *ibns*, a positive explanation of *aemulatur*, from a different point of attack, would be in order. To this I now address myself. I would seek to establish for *aemulatur* (and *imitatur*), not the rendering 'sucht gleich zu kommen', as cited above, but 'sequitur, follows, pursues' (cf. Livy, 1.18.2 *aemulantes studia* "pursuing their studies"). The Latin glosses (see Goetz, l. c.) exhibit the lemmata *imitantur* 'secuntur' and *amitatores* (i. e. *aemitatores*, *emitatores*) 'adsectatores'. Conformably, Lewis and Short's lexicon renders *secula sunt* (Caes. B. C. i. 2) by 'have followed, imitated'; and *sectatur* (Tac. Ann. i. 80) by 'seeks to imitate'; cf. also, *consequor*, I. B. 2, a. Further, Liddell and Scott define ἀκολουθεῖ by 'is like'. I would, in line with this definition, connect *aemulatur* with the Homeric nonce-word αἶμων (also once used as a proper name, Λ 296),² which occurs in the following context (E 49): . . . Σκαμάνδριον, αἶμονα θήρης Ἀτρεΐδης Μενέλαος ἔλ' ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι ἐσθλὸν θηρητῆρα . . . The ancient critics gave to αἶμων, here, a quasi etymological interpretation, defining it by *δαιμων for δαήμων 'sciens', but we need not take seriously this interpretation by a, perhaps purely imaginary, rhyme word. A satisfactory interpretation, so far as the context is concerned, for αἶμονα θήρης is 'follower, pursuer, taker of game (of the chase)', 'θηρητῆρα' in short. If the tautology of this

¹ It looks very plausible, we may admit, to derive Lat. *aemulatur*, Skr. *yamás* and Lat. *imitatur* from a common root with the grades *ayem-*, *yem-*, *im-*, respectively; but we might make as seductive a chain by deriving Lat. *aestus* 'boiling, undulating' (of water; cf. *aestas* 'summer'), Gr. ζεστός 'boiled', Skr. *īṣṭakā* ('terra') cotta' (cf. coquit 'cooks, boils') from a root *aḡes-*, *ḡes-*, *is-*, supposing intervocalic -ḡ- to be treated like -y- in Latin, as it seems to be in Skr. *yéḡate* (from **yaysate*), which belongs to this very root, *ḡes-* (cf. Pedersen, l. c., and Brugmann Grund.³ i, 922). So long as examples of intervocalic -ḡ- have not been identified in any Aryan speech, we may not certainly pronounce that said -ḡ- (-īḡ-) behaved differently from -y-.

² Not, I take it a pet name for Εὐ-αἶμων (Brugmann, Gr. Gram.³ §165, 1), but rather of the type of Στράβων (ibid. §165, 2).

interpretation raise objection, that objection disappears before a passage like β 65, . . . περικτίονας ἀνθρώπους οἱ περιναϊεταόουσι . . . in which the relative clause merely paraphrases περικτίονας (cf. also α 1, γ 383, θ 551, ι 271, χ 136, ι 123).

We may, because of the rough breathing in αἴμων, derive it with some confidence from αἰμῶν-, *αισμων.¹ If αἴμων has been correctly defined by 'pursuer, taker' we may explain αἰμύλος 'flattering' as a development on the lines of English *taking* 'captivating', and define αἰμύλος in its bad sense of 'wily' by Latin 'captans'.

The root to which I refer *aemulatur*, αἴμων and αἰμύλος is *ais-*, for which Brugmann (Grund., ii, § 670) cites the derivatives Skr. *ichāti* 'seeks', Umbr. *eiscurent*² 'poposcerint, arcessierint', Armen. *aic* 'undertaking' O. H. G. *eisca* 'demand', Lith.

¹ For the phonetic sequence whereby the rough breathing of αἴμων came to represent the lost -σ- of *αισμων I refer to Hirt's Griech. Gram. § 236, d. where, however, only one convincing illustration of the 'law' is cited, viz. ἡμαι 'I sit'. Even this illustration is not convincing till an examination of the Homeric usage reveals that forms of this verb with the sound sequence ἡμ- (for ἡσμ-) are, in a total of over 200 occurrences, more numerous than all the forms in ἡσ- (for normal ἡς-) etc. Thus we may be willing to concede that the spiritus asper spread from the 1st person and ptc. (ἡμενος) forms throughout the entire verbal flexion.

By this principle of sound change we may also account for the spiritus asper of εἵματα 'clothes', ἱμάτιον 'garment' whence, by analogy (note the frequent etymological figure of which εἵματα ἐσάμενος, β 3, may be taken as a type), ἐννυμι 'I dress' which would in truth be entitled to a normal rough breathing in the perfect forms εἵμαι and εἰμένω- (2 and 15 times respectively in Homer); or did -σν-, like -σμ-, yield -ν- (cf. the Prākritic change of -sm-, -sn- to -mh-, -nh-)? As we may thus account for the origin of the spiritus asper in the Greek root *Feσ-* 'to clothe', so we might charge the breathing of ἐστία 'hearth' and ἑσπερος 'Vesper' (root *Feσ-* 'to burn') to the analogy of the (secondary) aspiration of ἔως (for *ἔηως) 'dawn' and εὔει (for *εὔηει) 'singes'; not forgetting, however, the possibility that ἐστία 'hearth' may have been affected by ἔζεσθαι 'sits,' cf. especially the compound ἐφέστιος 'sitting on the hearth'.

Query: is the rough breathing of ἡμέρα 'day' also secondary—cf. Doric ἄμαρ (Homeric ἡμαρ) ἁμέρα (without intention, of course, to broach the problem of psilosis in the Homeric dialect, and of the correctness with which the aspiration was subsequently restored to the archaic portion of the Homeric vocabulary)—caught up from ἔως, ἑσπερος?

² Von Planta, Gram. § 66, in view of *ē* being the normal sequent in Umbrian of primitive *ai*, adjusts the difficulty of *eis-curent*, which would otherwise be a solitary offender against the usual sequence, by a derivation from **eh-isc-* or primitive **is-sko-*. But primitive *ei* also yields *ē* (though there may have been a slight acoustic difference between the two *ē*'s) and here again *ei-* appears,

jëszkóti 'to seek' (see other cognates in Uhlenbeck's ai. Woert. s. v. *íttē*).

A single basal definition of *ais-* is hard to give. In view of certain of its progeny, to be cited presently, it seems to enjoy a range from (1) 'capit, takes, seizes' to (2) 'captat, chases, (sequitur), covets, desires, entices'¹; and it makes little difference, semantically, whether we call *capit* the completive (perfective) of *captat*, or *captat* the inceptive (desiderative) of *capit*; cf. also Skr. *āpnōti* 'acquires, obtains': *īpsati* 'seeks, covets'; and Latin *properat* 'procures' (trans.) but 'hastens' (intrans.).

The entire semantic range projected for *ais-* lies transparent to our scrutiny in the Greek denominative verb *θηρᾷ*, which means not only 'chases, pursues, seeks' = 'captat, consequitur' (2); but also 'captures, hits, attains' = 'capit, consequitur' (1).

One further meaning (3) that we may expect to find for *ais-* will be 'hastens' (intrans.), cf. *contendit* and *properat* in their intransitive signification.

In accordance with the semantic considerations advanced above I would derive *aemulatur* '(con)sequitur' from the root *ais-* 'follows'; cf. Gr. *αἰμῶν* (from **αισμων*), 'follower'.

(10) *imitatur, imago*.

The Latin glossists consistently define *aemulatur* by 'imitatur', and our modern lexica, with more or less hesitation, have recognized the words as cognate. No phonetic obstacle hinders us in fact from deriving *imago* from **ismāgo* (*is-* in gradation with *ais-*), through the intermediate form *immāgo*, actually of record in the glosses, and attested (?) by Italian *immagine*: whether this *-mm-* is genuinely early, or only a late gemination, my control of the sources will not permit me to conjecture. But whatever value we give to the spelling *immago*, it is in entire accord with Latin phonetics to derive *imago* from **immāgo*, as we derive *omitto*

contra legem, in *eikvasatis eikvasese*, and *eitipes*. As to the last, the notion of 'umlaut' from the syllable *-ti-* suggests itself; and it seems curious that the two former words agree with *eiscurent* in being followed by a group of similar phonetic constitution, *-k v-* and *-scu-*. In all these cases I take *ei* to be an opener sound than *ē* (cf. von Planta, l. c. § 71), and the Umbrian syllables *-scu-* *-kv-* and *-ti-*, themselves tolerably open, might well have "cast their shadow before."

¹ Lewis and Short define *captat* by I. 'strives to seize, lays hold of with zeal, longing, chases' (cf. French *chasser* from **captiare*), II. A 'strives after, desires earnestly'; II. B 'seeks to catch in a crafty manner, entices, allures.'

from **ommitto*; or we might eliminate the intermediate stage **immágo*, and proceed at once from **ismágo* to *imago*, cf. *Cāmenae*, old Latin *Casmenae*. Other instances of the phenomenon under discussion are conveniently collected in Vendryes, *Intensité Initiale* § 72, with the omission, however, of the doublets *Cāsmēnae*/*Cāmēnae*, *cāsmillus*/*cāmillus* (cf. also the doublet *gemma*/*gisma*, as explained above, p. 166).

The derivation of *imitatur* from **i(m)mitatur*, **ismitatur* presents difficulties. It is conceivable, to be sure, (1) that a word beginning with a trochee (spondee) before its accented penult might have been reduced from $-\bar{\cup} \cup \bar{\cup}$ to $\cup \cup \bar{\cup}$, if the trochee owed its long syllable to a double consonant. I can adduce no other examples of such a phenomenon, though one might plead *bālistārius* (: *ballista*, but see Froehde, BB. 3, 286), or Catullus's *lāserpīciferis* (7. 4), neither of which will rouse conviction. Another possibility (2) would be to suppose that **i(m)mitatur* was brought into conformity with *i(m)mágo*: also not convincing.

It is not with *imitatur* that we must start, but with its primitive **imātur*, inferred from *imā-go*, cf. *vorāgo*: *vorat*; *forā-go*: *forat*; *orī-go*: *orīri*; *prurī-go*: *prurit*; *scaturī-go*: *scaturit*. The shortening of **imātur* from **ismātur* would entirely accord with the shortening of *Cāsmēnae*/*Camēnae*.

A possible trace of *immitatur* might be claimed for Plautus, viz. *Asin.* 372, where, without emendation, the first half of the *septenarius* would be read

móx quom Saúream ímmitábor,

and one need not be an out-and-out hiatus-hater to deny the cogency of Leo's (palaeographical) defence of the hiatus here by comparing the hiatus with the same proper name in vs. 85,

dotálem servom Saúreām uxór tua,

for the coupling of the hiatus and syllaba anceps (in the 4th thesis of the *senarius*) constitutes an important difference (see my edition of the *Mostellaria*, *Introd.* § 14, 11; and cf. *Cpt.* 159, 362; *Curc.* 438; *Men.* 327, 506; *Ps.* 58, for cases of syllaba anceps without hiatus).¹

¹ The Plautine usage (and there seems to be no other occurrence of *imitatur* in the pre-Vergilian poetry, save Livius Andronicus, *Achilles*, 1, 1, *si malos imitabo*, where *malos* is not clear in its reference) would seem to bear out the notion that *imitatur* originally meant 'follows'. At least it seems to me reasonable to suppose that a verb in the earlier stages of its restriction to a

(11) *ira* 'anger, Grimm'; *aerumna* 'anguish, Gram'; Avest. *aōšma* 'fury'.

Brugmann (I. F. 12, 401), in explaining *aerumna* from **ad-jerumna* (: *ges-* 'to boil'), declares roundly that *aerumna* has nothing to do with *ira*. One may wonder why he is so confident. The words are not alien semantically, cf. Lat. *tristis* (1) 'sad', (2) 'angry'; and a convincing separation of *ira* from *aerumna* can be made only after proof rendered that the *-r-* of the one is primitive, but of the other a rhotacized *-s-*. In point of formation Avest. *aōšma* 'fury' seems to bridge the way from *ira* to *aerumna*.

In view of Gr. *ῥέπος* 'longing', correctly derived in my opinion from **ῥεμπος* (: *aīs-* 'to seek'), and not from **ζεμπος* (so Bally, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* 12, 321), it would seem probable that *aerumna* 'trouble, anguish' (from **aesumna*) is an intensified 'longing, desiderium'. Or if we are right in defining *aīs-* by 'to take, seize' we might define *aerumna* by the English word 'a taking' (i. e. "a seizure, as of agitation, illness, pain or the like; hence a predicament; perplexity, trouble . . . a sickness, sore"; so the Standard Dictionary). Or if *aīs-* means 'to haste' we might compare Gr. *σπουδή* 'zeal, pains, trouble': *σπεύδει* 'hastes'. From the same sense of 'to haste (after), to chase', I would derive *ira*, Avest. *aōšma* 'anger', comparing English *hasty* 'choleric' and (Biblical) *haste* 'anger'. Note also *σπέρχεται* 'hastens', but metaphorically 'is angry with'. Further, if we recall the huntsman's epithet of *αἰμῶν* 'pursuer', we may get at the notion of *ira* 'anger' by comparing German *hetzen* 'jagen, to chase' probable cognates of which are *hass* 'hate' and *hast* 'haste'

somewhat technical sense should still admit of the application to it of the vanishing primary sense. This is eminently the case with *imitatur* in Plautus, so far as the examples under control by the Lemaire index allow one to speak finally, for it is combined with but a narrow range of objects, to wit: (1) fugitive slaves (Capt. 209, Cas. 397, 954); (2) a lizard (Cas. 443); (3) a caterpillar, "naughty beast" (Cist. 727); (4) a dog (Capt. 485); the two person objects are one *Saurea* 'Lizard' (Asin. 372) and *Stratonicus* (Rud. 932), in the following context:

post animi causa mihi navem faciam atque imitabor Stratonicum:
oppida circumvectabor.

With all these objects, it is submitted, the sense of 'sequitur' seems to peer out. [But cf. Cas. 657, *imitatur malarum malam disciplinam*.]

Note the persistence of the same connotation in Horace, A. P. 134, *nec desilies imitator in artum*.

(cf. Kluge, Etym. Woert. s. vv). Into this semantic group Skr. *īṣate* 'hastens' also fits.

(12) *aerumnula* 'carrying stick'.

The completive meaning found for *ais-* was 'capit, takes, seizes'. From this sense we can gain a definition of *aerumnula* (from **aesumnula*), the name of the 'stick with which porters carried their burdens'. If it be objected that 'to take' is not 'to carry' (it is in English), it is well to bear in mind that German *hebt* 'lifts' is cognate with Lat. *capit* 'takes'.

I here recapitulate the cognates so far pointed out of the root *ais-*, meaning (1) 'captat, chases, pursues, seeks'; (2) 'hastens'; (3) 'capit,—takes, seizes'; *αἶμονα θήρης* (E 49) 'sequentem feras': *αἶμον-*, from **aismon-*; *αἰμύλος* 'captans, taking' (a. 'captivating'; b. 'baleful, wily', cf. *captio* 'fraud, a sophism'); *aemulatur* 'sequitur', from **aesmulatur*; *imitatur* 'sequitur', frequentative to **i(m)mátur*, **ismatur*, cf. *immágo*; *ira* 'a taking, a fit of anger', from **aisā*; *aerumnula* 'a taking-stick', from **aesumnula*; *aerumna* ('pursuit, longing'), cares'.

Perhaps, in view of Gr. *αἰόλος* 'swift' (:Skr. *é-vas*, so Prellwitz, s. v.), which seems to be identical in formation with *evāras* (a hapax in RV. 8, 45, 38), an epithet of Soma for which 'sparkling, gleaming' (= Gr. *αἰόλος*) is a pat rendering, we should ascribe to *ais-* a briefer form *ai-*.

Prellwitz has a long list of words with initial *ai-* or *alo-* for which he gives either no etymological explanation at all or a very questionable one. Quite a number of these admit, both semantically and phonetically, of derivation from the root *ai-s-*, viz. *αἰ-κάλλει* 'flatters, captat'; *αἰμασιά* (from **αἰσμα-*) 'enclosure, wall': cf. *capsus* 'pen'; *αἶμος* (from **αἰσμο-*) 'thicket' [a chase, hunting ground (?)]; *αἰμωδία* (from *αἰσμο-*) 'tooth-ache' [cf. *aerumna* 'pain' (?)]; *αἰνιγμα* 'captio, sophism, riddle'; *αἰνυται* 'capit'; *αἰρεῖ* (from **αἰσπο-*) 'capit' [on this word Prellwitz makes the puzzling remark "*αἰρέω* hat aber die dunkeln Nebenformen aeol. *ἀγρέω*, thess. **ἀγγρε-*": might one extract from these words the definition *αἰρεῖ ἀγρεύει* 'captat, hunts, takes'?]; *αἰσάλων* (? **αἰσσαλων*) 'hawk, accipiter'(?); *αἰσθάνεται* 'λαμβάνει, accipit, percipit, tenet, takes (with the mind), perceives'. [Till some proof of the lost *F* is found, this explanation of *αἰσθάνεται* is at least as satisfactory semantically, and more probable phonetically, than the current derivation from **āFis-* *θανεται*. The older derivation of *au-dīt* from **aus-dīt* 'gives ear' (cf. Bréal, *Sémantique*,

p. 106) seems to me, in the light of *aus-cullat* 'lends ear' (see Brugmann, I. F. 11, 109), unexceptionable.^{1]}

In casting this long list of Greek words possibly cognate with the root *ai-s-* (1) *captat*; (2) *properat*; (3) *capit*, it has been my purpose neither to criticize nor present, in any detail, other possible explanations of said words. Nothing could be more prejudicial to the real advance of semantics than prejudice and dogma about etymologies. Certainty in etymology is hard to reach. Explanations may be in entire accord with morphological patterns and phonetic laws, and semantically plausible also, without carrying a particle of positive evidence. Thanks to complicated morphological constructions which admit much loss of consonants; thanks to the variety of vowel color and the frequency of the entire suppression of the vowel which jump with our complicated schemes of vowel gradation; thanks to the ease with which our whole wealth of words may be grouped, according to plausible psychological principles, about a relatively, or even absolutely, small number of concepts; thanks to the fact that a group of two or three sounds (letters is as well justified a designation for languages known only in their literary monuments) carries the inner meaning of an enormous quantity of derivatives, while only a few syllables, speaking relatively, of two or three sounds each, are conveniently vocable in any one language; thanks to all these considerations, it is in the interest of good method to remain open-minded to every etymological possibility that conforms to reasonable semantics and the better known principles of sound change. As to the established principles of sound change, it must never be lost to sight that the phonetic laws which are drawn from etymologies are made in turn a test of further etymologizing. The inherent weakness of such reasoning in a circle ought to constitute a warning against dogmatism.

¹ In spite of the Roman feeling that *oboedit* was a compound of *ob* and *audit*, shown by the recomposite *obaudit*, I believe that we must define *oboedit* (i. e. *obēdit*, a misspelling, I take it, for **obaedit*) by 'accipit', noting the glosses *accipit* 'ἀκούει, admittit, audit'. If the root *ais-* be correctly defined by (1) *sequitur*, *ἐπεραι*; (2) *capit*, then *oboedit* (for **obaedit*, from **ob-ais-dit*) may be properly defined either by 'ἐπεραι', or 'ac-cipit'. This resolution leaves intact the cognation of *ob-edīt* with *αἰσθάνεται*, though it separates *obedit* from *audit*. The abnormal treatment of *obēdit* (for **obidit*) may have proceeded from the simplex, *ēdit* being dialectic (? Umbrian, cf. von Planta, cited on p. 172); or else, when the *s* of **ais-dit* fell away, along with the compensatory lengthening, the quality of the diphthong was altered. [See postscript.]

For semantic studies it seems to me well to group provisionally about the 'roots' of any language all their possible progeny. We may subsequently learn from the minute correspondences of several kindred languages that our larger group contains more than one incorrect member, but we shall never acquire a feeling, a touch for semantic problems, save by studying numbers of large provisional groups in the individual languages.

(13) *carmen* 'song'; *casmillus* 'priest's apprentice'.

I have never been able thoroughly to give up the feeling that *carmen* belongs with *Carmenta*, the mother of Evander, who was 'fatiloqua' and 'veridica' (Livy, I, 7, 8, 10), and with *Cāsmēnae* / *Cāmēnae* 'Muses'.

One who connects *carmen* with *Carmenta* and *Casmenae*; with Skr. *śāsman* 'song of praise'; and with Gothic *hasjan* 'to sing' (pace Uhlenbeck, got. Woert. s. v.) has, in fact, much more evidence to rest upon than one who connects *carmen* with Gr. *kāpvξ* 'herald', Skr. *kāru-s* 'singer'. We must then derive *hasjan* from a verb *hāsýēti* (to which Latin **casiti* would correspond), cf. *carmen* from **casimen*. The pair **casimen*:**casiti* is comparable with *specimen*:*specitur*. It is hardly open to question that the syncope after -r- in **car(i)men* might have taken place earlier than syncope after a mute, cf. the doublet *tegimen*/*tegmen*; comparable is the complete loss of -e from the impv. *fer*, though Plautus knew the doublets *facel*/*fac* etc.

I further see no solid reason for separating Skr. *śāmsati* 'sings' from *śāsti* 'teaches, orders'. The vowel color of the -a- in *śāmsati*—which I derive from *hānsēti*, with Skr. *a* from *ə* under a secondary accent (see Wackernagel, ai. Gram. § 5, and his authorities as against Hirt, Ablaut § 15, and his authorities)—is inferred (see Uhlenbeck, ai. Woert. s. v.) from Albanian *θom* 'I say' (from **hēnsmi*); and the vowel color of the *a* of *śāsti* (ib. s. v.) from O. Ir. *cáin* 'law' (from **kāzni*). I venture with great reluctance into the realm of la haute phonétique, but I see nothing to show that Alban. *θom* may not come instead from *hēsmi*; and I make O. Ir. *cáin* a cognate of O. Ir. *cadhb* .i. *cáin* (see Stokes in Fick's Woert. ii² p. 67), deriving the one from **kadvos*, and the other from **kādnis*, cf. Strachan, in BB. 20, who maintains that the phonetic sequence *atn* yields *ān* (p. 8); *etn*, *ēn* (10); *utno*, *ōn*, *úan* (16); *udno*, *ōn*, *úan* (16). On the parallelism of *v(o)*- and *n*-stems cf. Pedersen in -KZ. 32, 253, § 17; and now Solmsen, ibid. 38, 438.

With this group I would place Lat. *canit* 'sings', from **kənēti*: the root *kēn-*. I derive Skr. *ḥāsmi* 'I teach' and Alban. *thom* 'I say'—for their semantic correlation cf. Gr. *δείκνυσι* 'shows': Lat. *dicit* 'says, speaks, sings (as a poet)'—from **kē(n)smi*, not with "unstable" *n*, but with an *n* lost in the heavy consonant group, and analogically lost in enough forms more—cf. the paradigm of *εἰμι* in Greek for the numerous forms in *ἦτ-*, for or beside forms in *ἦσ-τ-*, where the lost *-σ-* is due to the forms in *ἦμ-*—to yield a base *kēs-*, *kəs-* (Gothic *hazjan*), established as a byform to **kēns-*, *kəns-* (Skr. *ḥāṁsati*, with accent secondarily shifted as in *gācchati*, *yācchati*), *kṇs-* (Lat. *censet*). That a first person **kē(n)smi* 'δείκνυμι, dico' (for this definition cf. not only Alban. *thom*, but also the O. Bulg. and O. Persian cognates cited by Brugmann, I. F. 1, 177, 9) was liable to very frequent usage needs no demonstration. We may illustrate the correlation of ideas in *ḥāṁsati* 'sings' and *ḥāsti* 'teaches, shows' by comparing Latin *doctus* 'poet'. The Greek poet also often functioned as a διδάσκαλος (teacher).

The priest's apprentice at Rome was similarly *cāsmillus*/*camillus* 'Lehrling, pupil', cf. Skr. *ḥiṣ-yas* 'pupil'.

(14) Skr. *hiṁsanti* 'they injure': *hānti* 'kills'.

In view of Lat. *necat* 'kills' and *nocet* 'injures' there seems no reason to call in question the cognation of *hiṁsanti* and *hānti*. Neither does it seem necessary to waste words about the loss of sharp desiderative force in *hiṁsanti*, for *hiṁsanti* is a synonym in the Rig Veda of *piṁśānti* 'they grind, damage' and, as a synonym, may be closely modelled on it in its acoustic constitution. We might assume a primitive form **ghensōnti*, whose precise phonetic development in Sanskrit is not clear to me (cf. Hirt, Ablaut, pp. 17-18). Johannes Schmidt's present stem **ghi-(gh)n-só-* (Sonanten Theorie 57, sq.) seems to be quite fanciful, but before any one pronounces fanciful the notion that *hiṁsanti* and *piṁśānti* might, as synonyms, have been of effect, the one upon the inflexion of the other, he should note that *φάρος* 'killed' (Skr. *hatás*: *hānti*: 'kills') has, in the Homeric compound *μυλή-φαρος* 'ground-in-the mill' (β 355), the unmistakable sense of 'ground up'.

(15) *oportet* 'it behooves'.

There is no lack of attempts to explain *oportet* (see Vendryes, l. c. 305), all semantically possible, perhaps, but none convincing. In view of the accentual conditions alluded to

above (pp. 173-4), we need not hesitate to derive from **o(p)phortet*. This lets us surmise a connection between *oportet* 'it befits' and *opportunus* 'fitting'. Wharton defines *opportunus* by 'conducive' and so derives it from *portare*; cf. Gr. συμφέρει 'it profits'. A curious confirmation of that explanation, on its semantic side, seems to be offered by an explanation of *oportet* in terms of 'it behoves'; *behoves* comes from the verb *heaves* 'lifts, bears', compounded with the prefix *be-*. Thus *me oportet* is quasi 'it rises before me' or 'it bears me on'.

In inflection *oportet* is of a piece with its approximate synonym *deceit*.

Still another possibility is to connect *o(p)phortet* with *pars* and *portio*, and *pars* and *portio* ultimately with Gr. πέπρωται 'tis fated'. Then *opportunus* (:the root *per-*) is to be compared in formation with *fortuna* (:root *bher-*). The semantic relation of *oportet* 'it is necessary', compared with *pars* and *portio*, may be paralleled by Gr. μέρος 'part': μοῖρα 'fate'.

(16) *aperit* 'opens'.

As an illustration of the possibilities of etymology, as sketched above, p. 177, I take up the word *aperit* 'opens'. The great Thesaurus, with a regrettable lack of catholicity in a work intended and likely to impose authority on scholarship, reports Brugmann's derivation from **ap-verit*, to the exclusion of the older derivation from **a(p)-perit* (see Bréal et Bailly, Dict. Etym. s. v. *pario*, and especially Stowasser's Lat.-Deutsch. Schulwoerterbuch, Vorbegriffe, § 35, 5; also note the instructive semantic remarks in Lewis and Short's Dictionary, s. v. *comperio*). One must admit that the comparison of **ap-verit* with Lith. *at-veriu* 'ich mache auf, oeffne' (cf. Skr. *āpa-vṛṇoti* 'uncovers') is perfectly apt semantically, and one may think it likely that if *-pv-* came together in Latin a reduction to *-pp-*, *-(p)p-* would follow (cf. Stolz, Lat. Gram.³ p. 90). But why *ap-* (and *op-*) with **verit*, but *a-*, *ab-* (*ob-*), with all other compounds of verbs in *v-*? True, the lack of the simplex constitutes a difference in the case of **verit*; and yet, in view of the Oscan-Umbrian stem *vero-* 'door' (cf. also my derivation of *vestibulum* from **vero-stabulum* 'door-stead', Amer. Jour. Phil. 24, 62), one may wonder why the compound **ap-verit* (and **op-verit*) was absolved from the treatment usually accorded to *ab-* in composition with *v-*. Further, to allow that the phonetics of this explanation of *aperit* is correct, we must suppose the compound *apo-ver-* to have lived on into Latin

from the primitive Aryan speech. This is a somewhat different problem from noting that Latin preserves compounds the simplex of which is of record only in some other language, e. g. *dissipat* 'scatters'; Skr. *kṣipāti* 'flings' (if this is correct); for it leaves us to account for *apo-* dissociating itself in this one word from *apo-* in all other Latin words.

If we had of record **ap-verit* and **op-verit* [and here only is it necessary to suppose *op-* (:eni) rather than *ob-* (:O. Bulg. *obi*), cf. Uhlenbeck ai. Woert. s. v. *abhi*; Delbrueck, Vergl. Gram., Syntax, iii, p. 681], no one would dream of calling in question the cognation with Skr. *āpavṛṇoti*; but as *aperit* fails to authenticate **ap-verit* past all suspicion, one must not pin his faith, past recall, to this construct form.

What obstacle blocks the derivation of *aperio* from **ab-pario* with the older etymologists? The verb *parit* 'produces, procures' belongs closely with *parat* 'makes'; a pretty complete rendering for both in their entire range of usage is German 'schafft' (macht). A verb of such general signification easily comes, in combination with prepositions (adverbs of direction), to signify 'to open, to close'. Examples are German *aufmacht*, *aufthut* 'opens', *zumacht*, *zuthut* 'closes'; English *undoes* 'opens' (cf. Plautine *aperitin* fores 'won't you undo the door?'); also cf. Homeric *ἀν-ίησι* 'opens' and Latin *obicit* (Livy, I. 14, 11), *obducit* 'covers'. Such semantic developments are numerous enough to give us pause before we yield a final assent to the contention that *aperit* 'opens' comes more convincingly from **ap-verit* 'covers back', than from **a(p)-perit* 'makes, puts, sets back' (perhaps, with even more definiteness 'splits, cleaves back', cf. Gr. *πέπει* 'cleaves', Lat. *diffindit* 'cleaves apart, opens').

Not only does the old derivation of *aperit* from **a(p)-perit* seem to me phonetically impeccable¹ and semantically plausible, but a little ingenuity will supply other derivations not less plausible than the derivation from **ap-verit*. Thus, if hard put to it, we might derive *apértus* from **ab-portus* 'with the door off' (see Vendryes, l. c. § 301, for the reduction of "post-tonic" -or- to -er-), and deduce the whole verb system from this compound interpreted as a participle.

Going into Greek for cognates, who shall say, barring the difficulty with the -p- pointed out above, that *ap-erit* is not a

¹ The loss of *p* in *apério*, *apérinus* etc., *apériam* etc., *apériui* etc. *apértus* is normal; abnormal only in *dperis*, *dperit* and *dperiebam* etc.

compound in which *-er-* is a Latin cognate of Gr. ἀπαρίσκειν, which occurs in Homer with the sense of 'to close' (act., β 353; ptc. = 'closed', common); cf. also Lat. *artus* 'close(d)'.

Or who shall definitively say that **a(p)-perit* does not mean, by etymological definition, 're-velat'? Thus we might connect it with Gr. σπείρον 'cloth, wrap', with σπάρον 'rope', Lat. *sporta* 'plaited basket', all from a construct base *spera-* 'to plait' (so Prellwitz, s. v. σπείρα), with "unstable" *s-* (cf. the groups of cognates printed by Prellwitz, s. v. σπαρτός, and by Uhlenbeck, ai. Woert., s. v. *parṇām*, though, to be sure, the roots abstracted by these scholars have a very different definition, and accordingly different lists of cognates).

(17) Latin *parat* 'makes'.

So far as I know it has not been suggested that *parat* and *parit* are cognate with Gr. *πρα-κ-* in πράσσει 'does, makes' [see Prellwitz, s. v., and note the satisfactory treatment of the semantic relation between πράσσω and περάω (πέλω) in Liddell and Scott's lexicon; comparing also, for πράσσει and πείρει, Homer's διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον 'opening, cleaving a path', β 429, with his πείρε κέλευθον, β 434]. In Oscan we have a possible attest of the affix *-k-* of πράσσει, viz. in the words *comparascuster* (von Planta 17, 4) and *kú]mparakineis* (ib. 32). In the Tabula Bantina *comparascuster* is rendered by 'consulta erit', but a rendering of perfect etymological precision and well suited to the connection is 'comparata erit' (cf. Lewis and Short s. vv. 1 comparo, II. B; 2 comparo I. B). I shall not attempt to decide whether *comparascuster* is derived, in Latin transcription, from (1) **compara-scit* (: *comparat* : : *labascit* : *labat*) or (2) from **compara(c)-scit*. The latter reconstruction best accords with *kúmparakineis* (rather Latin **comparac-ionis* than **comparc-ionis*) 'consilii'. It is clear in its context that the council was a sort of 'finance board', a 'board of assessment', cf. Attic πράκτωρ 'tax-gatherer' (see also Liddell and Scott, s. v. πράσσω V. 2). To this special sense *comparascuster* will also conform, meaning, in its context, 'when the fine has been assessed'. The primitive Italic base *parā-c-* conforms better, in point of gradation (cf. Hirt, Ablaut, No. 187) with Gr. *πρᾶ-κ-* than a base *parc-* would conform.

Nothing decisive has been made out in my opinion for the contention that Oscan *comparascuster* is a cognate of Lat. *compescit* (see von Planta, § 296, 3 for the literature). In the examination of *compescit* too much account has been taken of

the consecutive entries in Festus (de Ponor, p. 42, lines 21-22) comperce pro compesce dixerunt antiqui, comparsit Terentius pro compescuit posuit. We are fortunately able to control the ipsissima verba on which these lemmata are based, viz., (1) Plautus Bacch. 463 caue malo et compesce in illum dicere iniuste, in contrast with Poen. 350 comperce me attractare; (2) Terence, Phormio 43-44 quod ille unciatim vix de demenso suo | suum defrudans genium, comparsit miser. If now we observe that Plautus could say (Poen. 1035) maledicta hinc aufer, linguam compescas face 'away with this cursing and hold (shut up) thy tongue', we will hardly challenge his saying compesce in illum dicere iniuste 'hold (shut up) thy speaking ill of him'. It did not require a particularly ingenious grammarian to compare this use of *compesce* 'shut up' (= 'don't') with *comperce* in comperce me attractare 'spare to (= don't) lay thy hand on me'; and, when he had made this identification, to contort into a further "Belegstelle" the Phormio citation, where de demenso suo . . . comparsit 'spared (saved) from his allowance' lent itself to the interpretation "pared (clipped, pruned) from his allowance". The proper philological comment on this interpretation of the form *comparsit* was made long ago in the Westerhov Terence, to wit: absurdum videtur.

The etymological interpretation of *compescit* seems to me most simple, along the semantic lines laid down in Lewis and Short. I derive it from **com-pag-scit* (: *pangit*) or **com-pac-scit* (: *paciscitur*) 'fastens, holds, keeps together'; its synonyms are *coercet*, *cohibet*, cf. Cato R. R. 139, *coercere* (with derived sense 'to clip, prune') *sacrum* (sc. *lucum*), with the entry from Festus, *compescere lucum est lucum suis finibus cohibere*. These passages show that in all three verbs the sense of 'dress, trim, clip, prune' had developed from a general sense of 'hold, keep together, arrange, dress'.

IV.—NOTES ON THE DELIAN CHOREGIC INSCRIPTIONS.

In 1881 the French excavations at Delos brought to light a series of choregic inscriptions which, along with the agonistic inscriptions pertaining to the Soteria at Delphi and the dramatic records of the Dionysia and Lenaea at Athens, are of immense importance for the history of dramatic and musical exhibitions in Greece in the third century B. C. and the first half of the second. Seven of the Delian inscriptions, cut on the same small round column, and four others, cut on rectangular blocks, were first published by Hauvette-Besnault in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* VII (1883), 103 ff.; a twelfth by Paris, *ibid.* IX (1885), 146 ff. They were republished after the French editors and discussed by Brinck, *Inscriptiones Graecae ad choregiam pertinentes*, Diss. Halen. VII (1886), 187-206.¹ Von Schöffer also treats them briefly in his *De Deli insulae rebus*, Berl. Stud. IX, 138 ff. The most recent discussion is by Capps, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* XXXI (1900), 112 ff. Many restorations and corrections of the published texts have been suggested by these scholars and by Wilhelm, *Jahreshefte d. oesterreich. arch. Inst.* III (1900), 49 ff., but so far as I know no careful examination of the stones themselves has been made since the publication in the *Bulletin*. Convinced that a reexamination of the originals would help to clear up many doubtful points in the text, at least by showing whether or not the proposed restorations and corrections were acceptable, I visited the museum at Myconos in February, 1903, with the intention of publishing a new text of the entire series, if the results of an examination of the stones should warrant it. But to my surprise I learned that the French authorities would not allow me to take squeezes or even to make notes in the presence of the stones, although published twenty years ago. Accordingly I was obliged to content myself with looking at a few lines of an inscription, going to the hotel and writing down my observations, then returning to the museum

¹ Michel, *Recueil*, Nos. 902-904, reproduces I, II, and V; Dittenberger *Sylloge*², No. 692, gives II.

and repeating the process. In this way I was able to gather a few notes on doubtful passages, which I here give to the public with some reluctance, fragmentary as they are. They are sufficient, however, abundantly to show the need of a careful republication of these and other Delian inscriptions, and it is to be hoped that the French, now that they have again turned their attention to Delos, will soon render this service to their colleagues of other countries.

My Roman numerals I–XI are identical with those of Hauvette-Besnault; the inscription published by Paris I refer to as XII, with Brinck. I follow Von Schöffer and Michel in giving the dates of Homolle; see Homolle, *Archives de l'intendance sacrée*, 58 ff. and appendices. Brinck, Dittenberger, and Capps keep the dates given by the first editors. The dates of Homolle are two years later except for XI and XII, and these one year later. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, and the writers in Pauly-Wissowa, also ignore the dates of Homolle. Brinck, followed by Capps, gives the year 280 to IV for some reason; Homolle's date is 279, Hauvette-Besnault's 281.

I, 284 B. C.; B. C. H. VII, 104. In l. 13 after ΟΣ we expect the father's name, and on the stone the first two letters of it are clear, ΚΝ In l. 22, after αὐληταί, Καφισίας Θηβαῖος, seven or eight letters have been destroyed, then can be read ΟΣ, showing that there was more than one flute player and that the plural in the caption was not used carelessly, as has generally been assumed. This is the case with most errors of this kind attributed to the engraver. So in VIII, l. 24, where the caption is likewise αὐληταί, a second name has been obliterated after Ὀνήσιππος (H.-B. "vide"). In XII, l. 79, Wilhelm is undoubtedly right in reading νευρο(σ)πάσ[ται] for the French editor's Νεῦρος, Παρ . . . , so that only a single name stands after the caption ὀρχηστής. In I, l. 26, Capps (p. 120, n. 3) would take ἑλληνοκράτης as an epithet, not as a proper name, thus removing another such error. I doubt if this is the correct reading, but have nothing better to suggest. After Ἀργεῖος and before ἑλληνοκράτης there are two letters, which I take to be ΚΡ, though they are so mutilated that they cannot be read with certainty. In IV, however, l. 23 f., the singular heading καθαρωιδές must stand before several names, unless, as Capps suggests, the stone cutter omitted by mistake a category after Κλέων Σικυνώσιος as the following ethnicon Ἀθηναῖος without a preceding proper name

would seem to indicate. In III, l. 22 we shall see that the singular *κιθαριστής* stands before only one name.

II, 282 B. C.; B. C. H. VII, 105. In l. 6 the first two letters of the name of the effaced choregus after *Τυχάνδρου* are 'Αφ. In l. 10 the stone actually reads *ΑΝΤΙΓΕΝΗΠΑΙΣΚΟΣ*, confirming Dittenberger's correction (*Syl.*² 692, n. 5) of the reported 'Αντιγένη[ς] Δίσκος to 'Αντιγέν<ης> 'Ηραΐσκος. The stone cutter's eye could easily pass over ΗΣ when ΗΡ followed. In l. 12 the reading is 'Αγλωνίας 'Οστάκου, for 'Α. Οϊτάκου. This is clearly an error for 'Αγλωνίης 'Οστάκου, the name which occurs among the choregi in III, as Brinck (p. 193) surmised. In l. 19 the stone gives *Θεμιστώνος Πάριος* (H.-B. Θε . . . τωνος Π.). Wilhelm in Michel, *Recueil*, Add. et corrig. p. 949, proposed *Θεμιστών Πάριος*, and this is probably right. The engraver's mistake might easily have been caused by the -ΟΝΙΟΣ in the line just above.

III, 280 B. C.; B. C. H. VII, 106. In l. 2 the editor's [παί]δων must stand. Traces of the *παι* can be made out on the stone. Brinck therefore is wrong when he says (p. 195) that *παίδων* was not used in these inscriptions for the choregi at the Apollonia until 259 B. C. (No. VIII), on the ground that such a caption was unnecessary, since only choruses of boys competed at this festival. His other ground for suspecting the French text, however, namely that only three choregi for the Apollonia are mentioned in this inscription, whereas in I, II, IV, V, VI, X and XII, i. e. in all the series where the names are preserved, four names are found, proves to be reasonable, though his solution was not right. The fourth choregus is in l. 5, omitted altogether by the first editor, and is fairly clear, 'Αλκίμαχος Προξένου. From here on the numbering of the French text must be changed. Alcimachus is already known as a Delian name; cf. Dittenberger, *Syl.*², No. 588, where an Alcimachus is mentioned as *ἱεροποιός*, *ταμίας*, and *τρικτύαρχος*. Returning to l. 2, I read *Δημοκράτης* as the first choregus (H.-B. Δημ-). In l. 17 (16) the stone gives *Διόφαντος* (H.-B. Διο-), to be identified with Capps (p. 124) with *Διόφ[αν]το[ς] Χίος*, also an aulete, in the Soteric list for 272 B. C. (Baunack, *Collitz' Samml.*, II, 6, 2563). In l. 18 (17) after *Τέλεισις Πάριος* the name of a comic actor is omitted, the first two letters being 'Αφ, with space for seven more letters. In l. 21 (20) the French text is . ΣΑ . for the name of the second tragic actor. My reading is *ΑΠΑ . ΩΝ*, confirming the conjecture of Capps (p. 117), who proposed *Δράκων*, which Homolle (B. C. H. XIV, 1890, 502) had restored in IV, l.

18 for Hauvette-Besnault's 'Ἀσάρων. Line 24 (23), which has aroused a good deal of discussion, is longer than the others and almost touches the inscription in the next column. The first editor reported "Ἀντόνομος (espace vide) (nom effacé)", and in the majuscule copy for the "nom effacé" gave ΣΟ . . ΑΙ. Brinck saw that a proper name is not wanted here, but rather a "novum artificum genus", and suggested κιθαρῳδοί or ῥαψῳδοί. Capps (pp. 122 f.), however, argued that the clew to the correct heading is to be supplied by the identification of the class of performers to which the three following names belong, Philemon, Nicostratus, and Ameinias. Now these names occur in close juxtaposition in the list of comic poets victorious at the Lenaea¹ at Athens, C. I. A. II, 977 g. Judging by the position of these names with reference to that of Menander, the date of whose first Lenaeian victory can be inferred within narrow limits, we learn that the first Lenaeian victories of Nicostratus and Ameinias fell in the last years of the fourth century i. e. about twenty years before our inscription. For the elder Philemon we have more exact dates. His first Dionysian victory was won in 327 (Frag. Mar. Par., Wilhelm, Ath. Mitth. XXII, 187; cf. Anon. π. κωμ. II, p. 9 Kaibel), but he was active until extreme old age, dying about the time of the Chremonidean war, ca. 263 B. C. (Suid. s. v. Φιλήμων). He could therefore have produced a play at Delos in 280. Now on the strength of these considerations Capps concluded that these three persons were κωμικοποιοί and proposed that this word (which is used in the other Delian inscriptions) or its equivalent (π)ο[ητ]αί [κωμικοιδιῶν] should be restored as the heading. And in fact ποιηταί κωμικοιδιῶν is found on the stone. Though the letters have been somewhat mutilated, they can still be made out with absolute certainty. It is hard to see how they could have escaped the French editor.

For the sake of clearness I reproduce my copy of III, omitting the part pertaining to the Dionysia, where my copy agrees entirely with that given in the Bulletin.

Ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Χάρμου (280 B. C.) οἶδε ἐχορήγησαν
εἰς Ἀπολλώνια· (παί)δων· Δημοκράτης,
Πύρραιθος Φιλαίθου,
Ἱερόμβροτος Εὐδήμου,
5 Ἀλκίμαχος Προξένου.

¹ Not the Dionysian list; cf. Am. Jour. Phil. XX (1899), 388 ff.

- 16 οἶδε ἐπεδείξαντο τῶι θεῶι· ἀλῆται·
 Τιμόστρατος Κυζικηνός, Διόφαντος·
 κωμωιδοί, Τέλεσις Πάριος, Ἄφ ,
 Ἱερώνυμος, Πολυκλῆς, Μενεκλῆς,
 20 Σιμίας Ἀθηναῖος, Διόδωρος Σινωπεύς·
 τραγωιδοί· Θεμιστών, Δρά[κ]ων,
 Διονύσιος, Ἀρίσταρχος, Ἠγήσιππος·
 κιθαριστής· Λύσανδρος· (ὁ)¹ ρ[χ]ησταί]
 Αὐτόνομος, Ν ποιηταὶ κωμωιδῶν·
 25 Φιλήμων, Νικόστρατος, Ἀμεινίας.

We are glad to know the names of a few of the comic poets who brought out plays at Delos. In VII, l. 25 (263 B. C.) we have Nicomachus the Athenian, and in VIII, l. 26 (259 B. C.) Chrysippus. We now possess three more names. Philemon is probably, as I have indicated above, Philemon the elder, rather than his son, who was known as νεώτερος and is so designated in the Athenian record C. I. A. II, 975, col. III, l. 11; cf. Suid. s. v. Φιλήμων νεώτερος.² Our Nicostratus must be the poet of the New Comedy. Meineke Hist. Crit. I, p. 346 thought that there was but one poet of the name, but fresh light is brought by C. I. A. II, 977 g. l. 14 and by our Delian inscription. One Nicomachus is assigned to the Middle Comedy by Athen. 587 d. He must be the one who is reported to be the son of Aristophanes and confounded with Philetaerus, and may be identical with the comic poet of the Icarian inscription C. I. A. IV, 2, 1281 b, as Buck surmised (see Kirchner, No. 11038). The other poet is assigned to the New Comedy by Harpocration s. v. ὀρνιθευτής. We know nothing further about Ameinias than that he is identical with the poet of the Athenian list, mentioned above. See Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. I Heft, s. v. Ameinias.

¹ The stone ΔΡ, as H.-B., but Capps' correction (p. 120 f.) is likely.

² Kirchner, Prosop. Att. No. 14276, following Köhler, distinguishes a third comic poet Philemon, and he must be right if insc. II, 975, col. III is to be dated ca. 184/3. The designation νεώτερος was in that case intended to distinguish him from the second of the name, the son of the great Philemon. And the Philemon in the victor's list C. I. A. II, 977 / might seem to favor this view. But the dates at present assigned to the fragments of 975 cannot be regarded as even approximately correct; cf. Dittenberger, Syl.², No. 697, n. 7. Wilhelm's long-awaited edition of these inscriptions will doubtless settle this and many other open questions on the chronology of the comic poets.

IV, 279 B. C.; B. C. H. VII, 108. In l. 5 for $\kappa \dots \iota\theta\omicron\nu$ read $\kappa\nu\alpha\iota\theta\omicron\nu$. The name is not found in Pape's Eigennamen nor in Fick-Bechtel's Personennamen; cf., however, $\Pi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\rho\alpha\iota\theta\omicron\varsigma$, which occurs in II and III, and $\Phi\iota\lambda\alpha\iota\theta\omicron\varsigma$, which is found in III.

V, 268 B. C.; B. C. H. VII, 110. In l. 32 the stone reads $\text{'}\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\nu\mu\omicron\varsigma$, as Capps (p. 119) conjectured, not $\text{'}\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$. This is the comic actor whose name occurs also in III. He appears as victor at the Lenaea at Athens in the year 289 (C. I. A. II, 972; cf. *Am. Jour. Arch.* IV (1900), 74 ff.) and was four times victorious at that festival (C. I. A. II, 977 $\mu\nu$). In l. 33 $\chi\acute{o}\rho\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is the reading on the stone, Hauvette-Besnault read $\chi\omicron\rho\eta\gamma \dots$, taking it as a caption. Paris (B. C. H. IX, 153) conjectured $\chi\omicron\rho\eta\gamma[\acute{o}\varsigma]$. But Brinck (p. 197) restored it as a proper name, the name of a comic actor, like Ergophilus who precedes. There can now be no doubt about this. Before Choregus we have the famous comic actor $\text{'}\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\nu\mu\omicron\varsigma$ and after him the names of $\kappa\acute{\alpha}[\lambda]\iota\pi(\pi)\omicron\varsigma$ and $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$. Callippus has been identified with the comic actor at the Lenaea at Athens in 306 B. C. (C. I. A. II, 1289) and credited with four Lenaeian victories in C. I. A. II, 977 $\mu\nu$, while Cleoxenus is one of the comic actors at the Soteria in the year 272. Choregus must, therefore, also be the name of a comic actor. A. Muller¹ conjectures that he was a grandson of the comic poet Choregus mentioned in C. I. A. II, 977 f . The name is not, in fact, a common one, no Athenian of this name being known, for example (cf. Kirchner).

VII, 263 B. C.; B. C. H. VII, 112. In l. 8 before $\text{'}\alpha\nu\alpha\chi\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$ the stone gives $\text{H}\Sigma$ and the name must be $[\Pi\acute{\alpha}\chi]\eta\varsigma \text{'}\alpha\nu\alpha\chi\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$, who in V was choregus at the Apollonia and in VI (265 B. C.) at the Dionysia. We have a good many cases in these inscriptions of the recurrence of the same name among the choregi of different years (Von Schöffer, p. 141, n. 121), but if my reading of $\text{H}\Sigma$ here is right, we have the first case of a man serving three times, and that within ten years. Brinck, (p. 199), who thought of this possible restoration, regarded it as improbable on this account, though Von Schöffer seems to restore as I have done. In l. 12 I read $\Delta\nu\sigma\iota\delta\acute{\eta}\mu\omicron\nu$ for $\Delta\nu[\sigma\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}]\omicron\nu$. In l. 24 after the comic actor $\Phi\iota\lambda\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\varsigma$ Hauvette-Besnault indicates space for five letters and then $-\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\varsigma$. But there is space for only about three letters;

¹Philologus LXI (1902), 160. Both he, and Körte in the Suppl. to Pauly-Wissowa, seem not to have known that the credit for the correct interpretation of this word belongs to Brinck.

I read [*Ιππ]αρχος, the stone showing traces of the two first letters. No comic actor of this name is known from other sources. Our actor could scarcely be the ὑποκριτής, Νεαίρας ἐραστής, of [Dem.] 59, 26, who Kirchner (Prosop. 7599) suggests may be the tragic actor of C. I. A. II, 977 ο, for the date of this oration is between 343 and 340 according to Blass (Att. Bered. III, 1, 536).

I may add here a note on the omission of the bar in Θ and Α, which led to Hauvette-Besnault's strange error of δλυματοποιός for θαυματοποιός (Dragoumis in B. C. H. VII, 384). Dragoumis suggested that the point of the Θ and the bar of the Α escaped the eye of the copyist. This is not the case, for neither exists on the stone in this inscription and are often omitted in other inscriptions of this series. They were undoubtedly painted in, and whenever in these inscriptions we find Ε for Ε, Α for Α, or Ο for Θ, we may be certain, I think, that the missing stroke was supplied in color, of which distinct traces still remain, especially in VIII.

VIII, 259 B. C.; B. C. H. VII, 114. In ll. 19, 20, if the reading 'Ιεροκλέ[ους] were correct, the preceding name would have had fourteen or fifteen letters, which is not probable. The stone actually gives at the end of l. 19 ΙΕΡΟΚΛΕΙ and in l. 20 . . . Σ. Read therefore 'Ιεροκλείδης, as Capps (p. 119) suggested. In the space before this name, accordingly, stood the name of a comic actor and his ethnicon, in all probability. In l. 21 the stone reads clearly ΑΚΑΡΝΑΝΔΙΣΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΟΣ and in l. 22 . . . ΑΚΙΔΕΥΣ, confirming Capps' conjecture (p. 119) Σωτίων 'Ακαρνὰν δις, Παράμονος Χαλκιδεύς for Hauvette-Besnault's 'Ακαρν[άν, *Η]λις Παραμόνο[υ]] δεύς. The editor evidently did not see the lower line of the Δ. It is not so well cut as the rest of the letter, but it still exists and was of course perfectly clear when the color was fresh. We have the name of a Paramonos, probably a Chalcidian, in an inscription 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1902, 111, Παράμονος 'Απολλοδώρου. The ethnicon is not given, but the inscription was found at Chalcis. In l. 24 the majuscule copy gives "ΟΝΣΙΕΠΠΟΣ vide". But 'Ονήσιππος is clear. A name followed, but the stone is so mutilated that I could not read it.

IX, not long after 263 B. C.; B. C. H. VII, 115. ΚΑΤΑΤΟΝ reported in l. 9 should be read in the line below. The text in l. 9 is ΚΑΤΕΟΥΝ, omitted altogether by the editor.

X, 201 B. C.; B. C. H. VII, 117. In l. 34 read ΚΑΔΩΣ, not ΚΑΛΩΣ. The same word κάδος occurs in the inventories in

V, VI, VII, and VIII. In l. 59 the stone gives ΡΟΠΤΕΙΟΝ, not ΤΟΡΕΥΤΟΝ. The *φιάλη γοργείας* occurs several times in XII.

XII, 171 B. C.; B. C. H. IX, 147. In ll. 76, 77 Paris read *Αν . . . δος* as a proper name. Wilhelm proposed *λυ[ρωι]δός* as a caption; Capps (p. 121)¹ *αἰ[λωι]δός*. The reading is *ΑΥΛΟΙΔΟΣ*. The third letter cannot have been P; therefore the performer was certainly an *αὐλωιδός*.

While studying these choregic inscriptions at Myconos I took occasion to look at No. 270, published in B. C. H. XIV (1890), 389 ff. At the end of this inscription Homolle reads *εἰς τὸ λ|[ογε]ῖον τῆς σκηνῆς | . . . μου τετράπηχυν*. The word *λογεῖον* was considered a probable restoration by Dörpfeld, but doubted by his collaborator Reisch.² Both make the mistake of including the λ in the brackets, for it is clear on the stone and is given in Homolle's copy. The source of the dispute which has arisen about this word lies in the simple fact that it is always given as *λ|[ογε]ῖον*, which is not possible, since there is not space enough at the beginning of the line for three letters before *-ιον*. My reading was, at the end of l. 134, *ΛC*, and at the beginning of l. 135 *-EION*. Homolle's reading must therefore be simply changed to *λο|[γ]εῖον*. I feel sure that any epigraphist, after an examination of the stone, would agree that this is the correct reading.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

¹ His *αἰ[λωι]δοί* on p. 121 is evidently a misprint; cf. p. 137 *αἰ[λωι]δός*.

² Griech. Theat., p. 148 and p. 301.

V.—SOME REFERENCES TO SEASICKNESS IN THE GREEK AND LATIN WRITERS.

My interest in this somewhat forbidding subject dates back to the year 1896, when, while crossing the ocean, I read, in a little periodical published by the White Star line, the statement that no references to seasickness occur in the ancient writers, whence it was inferred that the complaint is purely a modern one. I have since tried to get a copy of this periodical, but I find that it is out of print.

Since one or two eminent philologists, to whom I spoke of the matter that summer, had no more information than I myself had, and since the handbooks and commentaries seem to be entirely silent on the subject, the references which I have since collected may be of some interest.

Probably the most familiar passage is that in Hor. Epist. I. 1. 93 *conducto navigio aequè nauseat ac locuples, quem ducit priva triremis*. It is rather curious that no editor except myself cites a parallel passage in this connection—or indeed in connection with the other references to the subject in classical literature, so far as I know—or raises the question whether the complaint was a common one, as we might perhaps infer from this reference alone; though I must admit that I probably should not have done so if my attention had not been called to the matter in the way I have mentioned.

Horace apparently has another reference in Epod. 9. 35 *vel quod fluentem nauseam coerceat, metire nobis Caecubum*. Here many editors regard *nauseam* as referring to the effect of excessive potations, especially of the sweet Chian and Lesbian wines. I think, however, that the word means "seasickness", with a punning allusion, of course, to Horace's disgust at Antony's conduct. This interpretation may not, as some claim, be preferable to the other on grounds of decency in the case of a Roman poet, and one so little fastidious as Horace, but it seems more appropriate to the situation. The use of *nausea* in this double sense suits the reference to the sea; and on the other hand, immediately after calling for wine in large cups, to celebrate

the victory, Horace would not be likely to anticipate the effect on his stomach. Such thoughts arise more commonly on the following morning. But if Horace was subject to seasickness, he might well, when in the grasp of Neptune, regulate his beverages accordingly. I should translate the passage as follows: "Give me Chian or Lesbian in huge cups, or rather (since I am on the sea—in imagination or actually) pour me out Caecuban, to stay my rising qualms (of seasickness—disgust)".

That the subject is not mentioned in the Homeric poems cannot be taken as evidence that the people of those times were immune. It might be said that the subject is not one which would be likely to be mentioned in epic poetry. And yet, considering the story of Elpenor, in *Odyss.* X. 552-560, who fell into a drunken sleep on the roof of Circe's palace, and "forgetting in his mind to descend backwards, when he came to the long ladder", fell from the roof and broke his neck; or the realistic account of the throwing overboard of Menoetes by Gyas in *Aen.* V. 172-180; and various other incidents of the same kind; it does not seem impossible that in the lighter passages, and of the humbler personages, some mention of so vulgar a complaint might have been made with comic effect. But since, as we shall see, the humorous aspect of the complaint does not seem to have struck the ancients so forcibly as it does the moderns, the lack of references can hardly be regarded as significant.

With reference to the Homeric heroes, we have the jesting remark of Seneca, *Epist.* 53. 4 *illud scito, Ulixem non fuisse tam irato mari natum, ut ubique naufragia faceret: nausiator erat.* This seems unquestionably a reference to the proverbial seasick pilot mentioned below, who seems to have escaped the vigilance of our collectors of proverbs.¹

The fact that the earliest reference in Greek seems to occur in Aristophanes, and that the references as a whole are somewhat less numerous than those in Latin, may be because the seafaring Greeks were less subject to the malady than the Romans, or an evidence of better taste; or it may be purely accidental. I should reject the second hypothesis for the reasons already given, and the first seems improbable because such references as do occur are of a matter-of-fact nature, as if to a

¹ Otto, *A. L. L.* VI. 22, cites Sen. *Epist.* 85. 29 *tranquillo enim, ut aiunt, quilibet gubernator est.* Cf. Sutphen, *A Collection of Latin Proverbs*, p. 137.

common and well-known thing. Thus Arist. Rhet. III. 4. 3 ὁ Δημοσθένης τὸν δῆμον, ὅτι ὁμοίως ἐστὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πλοίοις ναυτιῶσιν. A reference which is clearly of a proverbial character occurs in Plato, Legg. 639 B χρηστὸς δὲ ἄρχων ἔσθ' ἡμῖν ἐν πλοίοις πότερον ἐὰν τὴν ναυτικὴν ἔχῃ ἐπιστήμην μόνον, ἢ τ' οὖν ναυτιᾷ ἂν τε μή; . . . τί δ' ἄρχων στρατοπέδων ἂρ' ἐὰν τὴν πολεμικὴν ἔχῃ ἐπιστήμην, ἱκανὸς ἄρχειν, κἂν δειλὸς ὢν ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς ὑπὸ μέθης τοῦ φόβου ναυτιᾷ; Closely parallel to the latter reference, and undoubtedly suggested by it, or by the same proverb, is the one in Sen. Epist. 108. 37 non magis mihi potest quisquam talis prodesse praeceptor, quam gubernator in tempestate nauseabundus . . . quid me potest adiuvere rector navigii attonitus et vomitans?

Seneca himself was subject to the malady, as appears from Epist. 53. 3 nausea me segnis haec et sine exitu torquebat, quae bilem movet nec effundit. To this annoying phase of the disorder Celsus refers from the physician's standpoint in I. 3, p. 17. 28 D. qui navigavit, et nausea pressus est . . . si sine vomitu nausea fuit, etc. Seneca's suffering was so great that he insisted on being put ashore, and more fortunate than some victims of modern times, he carried his point: institi ergo gubernatori et illum, vellet nollet, coegi petere litus.

In two other passages Seneca refers to seasickness as a thing to be expected: Epist. 53. 5 ut primum stomachum, quem scis non cum mari nausiam effugere, collegi . . . hoc coepi mecum cogitare; De Ira III. 37. 3 numquis se hieme algere miratur? Numquis in mari nausiare, in via concuti? It may have been this tendency on Seneca's part which led him to refer to the subject more often than any other ancient writer, although my own interest in the question was not aroused in that way. I have always been kindly treated by Neptune—o di immortales, avertite et detestamini, quaeso, hoc omen! If, as some modern experts believe, the seat of the trouble is the eye, Horace, who was *lippy*, may have been led by personal experience to refer to seasickness alone among Roman poets outside of comedy, so far as I have observed.

Nervous men, such as Seneca seems to have been, are said to be especially unhappy at sea, and we should expect Cicero, who was of the same temperament, to suffer in a similar way. An indication that he did is the fact that he mentions the subject several times, and once in such a way as to imply that he usually succumbed, while one passage convicts his friend Atticus of a

similar weakness. These references are: ad Att. V. 13. 1 *navigavimus sine timore et sine nausea*, apparently an unusual and noteworthy experience; ad Fam. XVI. 11. 1 (to Tiro) *festinare te nolo, ne nauseae molestiam suscipias aeger et periculose hieme naviges*; ad Att. V. 21. 3 *illa tua epistula, quam dedisti nauseans Buthroto*. It is possible that this tendency eventually hastened his end, for we read of him in Sen. Rhet. Suas. 6. 17 *unde aliquotiens in altum provectum cum modo venti adversi rettulissent, modo ipse iactationem navis, caeco volvente fluctu, pati non posset, taedium tandem eum et fugae et vitae cepit*.

Casual allusions are found in Caes. B. C. III. 28. 4 *tirones multitudine navium perterriti et salo nauseaeque confecti . . . se Otacilio dederunt*; Bell. Afr. 34. 6 *legiones equitesque ex navibus egressos iubet ex languore nauseaeque reficere*; Suet. Calig. 23 *cum et Silanus impatientiam nauseae vitasset et molestiam navigandi*. Whether the reference in Liv. XXI. 26. 5 *necdum satis reffectis ab iactatione maritima militibus*, is to seasickness, as Professor Wheeler, of Bryn Mawr, has suggested to me, or merely to the general discomforts of a rough voyage, is uncertain. The passages cited above from Caesar and from the Bell. Afr. certainly suggest that the Roman soldiers were troubled in that way, and *iactationem navis* in the passages cited from Sen. Rhet. is most naturally taken as including seasickness. *Iactatio navis* or *maritima* was doubtless a more comprehensive term, including knocking about, loss of sleep, and the like. *Iactatio* without a qualifying word is used by Cicero in this sense, where the meaning is clear from the context: Mur. 2. 4 *quo tandem me animo esse oportet prope iam ex magna iactatione terram videntem in hunc, cui video maximas rei publicae tempestates esse subeundas*. If these references are to seasickness, there may be others of a similar indirect nature, although I have run across but one. This is in Caes. B. C. III. 28. 5 and is but a few lines after the direct reference in B. C. III. 28. 4 which is cited above. It reads: *at veteranae legionis milites, item conflictati et tempestatis et sentinae vitiis, neque ex pristina virtute remittendum aliquid putaverunt, et . . . gubernatorem in terram navem eicere cogunt*. In Greek we have one in Alciphron, Epist. II. 4. 9, a passage to which my attention was called by Mr. Lee, of the Central High School, Philadelphia: *καὶ σφόδρα τῶν εὐθαλάσσιων γεγένημαι, εὖ οἶδα, καὶ ἐκκλωμένης κόπης ναυτίας ἐγὼ θεραπεύσω. θάλψω σου τὸ ἀσθενεῖν τῶν πελαγισμῶν*. In this passage *ναυτίας* is regarded

both by Jacobs and by Meineke as a gloss explanatory of τὸ ἀσθενεῖν τῶν πελαγισμῶν, which has found its way into the text, and this view seems to me to be correct, and to be demanded by the sense of the passage.

That animals, as well as men, sometimes suffered from seasickness is seen from Bell. Afr. 18. 4 cum . . . Caesaris equites iumenta ex nausea recenti, siti, languore, paucitate, vulneribus defatigata ad insequendum hostem perseverandumque cursum tardiora haberent. Fronto seems to imply that the trouble was more common in hot weather, although of course comparatively little voyaging was done in winter. He says, p. 15 N. hiemps est et crudum mare hibernum est: adesse non potuit. Ubi hiemps praeterierit, vernae tempestates incertae et dubiae moratae sunt. Ver exactum est: aestas est calida et sol navigantis urit et homo nauseat. Autumnus sequitur: poma culpabuntur et languor excusabitur.

As a cure for the disease, or rather as a preventive, Horace's prescription of a dry wine—if his reference is to seasickness, as I have no doubt it is—was probably a favorite one, as champagne is to-day. Decidedly less attractive, and doubtless less popular, was that proposed by Pliny, N. H. XXVII. 52 nauseas maris arceat in navigationibus potum absinthium.

Plato incidentally shows that, as is notoriously the case in modern times, the sufferers became wholly oblivious of external discomforts: see Theaet. 191 A εἰς δὲ πάντα ἀπορήσωμεν, ταπεινωθέντες, οἶμαι, τῷ λόγῳ παρέξομεν ὡς ναυτιῶντες πατεῖν τε καὶ χρῆσθαι ὅτι ἂν βούληται. It has been observed that Plato here seems to follow Soph. Ajax 1142 ff., though the idea was probably a proverbial one. The words of Sophocles are as follows:

ἦδη ποτ' εἶδον ἄνδρ' ἐγὼ γλώσση θρασὺν
ναύτας ἐφορμήσαντα χειμῶνος τὸ πλεῖν,
ὃ φθέγμ' ἂν οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἤνρες ἥνικ' ἐν κακῷ
χειμῶνος εἶχετ', ἀλλ' ὕφ' εἵματος κρυφεῖς
πατεῖν παρείχε τῷ θέλοντι ναυτίλων.

Here and in Synesius, Epist. IV. p. 163 D, where we have a very similar passage: μεθήκεν ὁ κυβερνήτης τὸ πηδάλιον καὶ καταλαβὼν ἑαυτὸν πατεῖν παρείχε τῷ θέλοντι ναυτίλων: there is no mention of seasickness, but the general symptoms seem to suggest it, as well as Plato's version. In Synesius, at least, and probably in all three passages, we clearly have another reference to the proverbially

inefficient seasick captain. *Nautia* and its derivatives do not occur in the lexicons to Aeschylus and Sophocles, but this passage from the *Ajax* is perhaps evidence that reference to so unpoetic a thing is not impossible in the higher walks of literature.

To judge from the vast number of jests on seasickness in modern times, we should expect it to be made much of by the writers of comedy and satire; but the subject seems to have been taken somewhat more seriously in antiquity. In Greek I have found but one such reference—I must admit that my reading in Greek has not been extensive of late—and that of a rather casual nature. It occurs in Aristoph. *Thesm.* 882 ff.:

οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ ναυτίας ἔτ', ὦ ξένη,
ὅστις γ' ἀκούσας ὅτι τέθηκε Πρωτέας
ἔπειτ' ἐρωτᾷ, "Ἐνδον ἔστ' ἢ ἑλώπιος;

In Latin the references are somewhat more numerous, though the subject cannot be said to have been done full justice. In *Plaut. Amph.* 329, *lassus sum hercle e navi, ut vectus huc sum: etiam nunc nauseo*, the remark seems of a casual nature, though it might have been given a comic effect by appropriate stage business. The reference in *Mer.* 388 appears to me to be more subtle: *in portum huc ut sum advectus, nescioqui animus mihi dolet. Nausea edepol factum credo: verum actutum abscesserit.* Here the allusion may be merely to the mental effect of the disorder to which Aristophanes refers; but I am inclined to see rather the same variety of joke as in the following passage from *Jerome's Three Men in a Boat*. ch. II: "If you were to stand at night by the seashore with Harris, and say: 'Hark! Do you not hear? Is it but the mermaids singing deep below the waving waters; or sad spirits chanting dirges for white corpses, held by seaweed', Harris would take you by the arm and say: 'I know what it is, old man; you've got a chill. Now, you come along with me. I know a place round the corner, where you can get a drop of the finest Scotch whiskey you ever tasted—put you right in less than no time.'" That is, *Charinus* says, 'my mind is troubled'. To which *Demipho* replies, 'Oh! that's seasickness: you'll soon be all right'. Somewhat similar is the jest in *Stichus* 749 *totus doleo. Potus? tantum miserior*, although here *totus* is purposely misunderstood as *potus*. Cf. *Most.* 375 *ego disperii. Bis peristi? qui potest?*

Festus, p. 166 Th. d. P. also cites Plautus in the Artemo, . . . lionum nauteam fecisset, which is expanded in the Forcellini-De Vit Lexicon into unguentum quod navibus mulionum nauteam fecisset (Müller in his edition of Festus has *naribus*). The other lexicons follow the Forcellini in giving *nauteam* in this passage the meaning of "seasickness", or "nausea", but since this would be the only example in Latin literature of the spelling *nautea* in this sense, and as Plautus himself elsewhere uses *nausea* and *nauseo* of seasickness, I believe that the word either means "bilge-water", or has the general meaning of an offensive odor which is derived from that signification; very likely the latter would best suit the connection with *muliones*, if the mutilated word in Festus is to be thus filled out, as seems probable enough. Plautus elsewhere uses *nautea* in the sense of "bilge-water" or something similar; the former meaning will suit all the passages in which the word occurs: cf. Asin. 894 nauteam bibere malim . . . quam illam oscularier; Curc. 100 omnium unguentum odor prae tuo nautea est; Cas. 1018 ircus unctus nautea.

In Satire we have the passage of Horace which was quoted at the beginning, while Petronius, in his romance, 103, gives us the most vivid picture of all ancient writers: unus ex vectoribus, qui acclinatus lateri navis exonerabat stomachum nausea gravem, notavit sibi ad lunam tonsorem intempestivo inhaerentem ministerio, execratusque omen, quod imitaretur naufragorum ultimum votum, in cubile reiectus est. Nos dissimulata nauseantis devotione ad ordinem tristitiae redimus.

The words *ναυρία*, *ναυσία*, with the corresponding Latin forms, seem to have received little attention from the phonologists. The original form in Greek was *ναυρία*, which in accordance with the well-known rule that τ in the middle of words before ϵ followed by another vowel becomes σ in all dialects, should become *ναυσία*. As a matter of fact, *ναυρία* and *ναυτιάω* occur in all the examples which I have found in Greek. Kretschmer, K. Z. XXX. 573 cites Ionic *ναυσίη*, and suggests that *ναυρία* is due to the analogy of *ναύτης* and *ναυτίλος*, and *ναυσίη* to that of **ναύσιος* in *ἐπιναύσιος* and *περιναύσιος*. This is a reasonable hypothesis, so far as *ναυρία* is concerned, though *ναυσίη*, which is not cited by the lexicons and is certainly rare, seems to need no justification. See also Smyth, The Ionic Dialect, p. 304.

Why the prevailing form in Latin, where the word is a loan-word, as is incidentally shown by the failure of the s to suffer

rhotacism, is *nausea*, does not seem to have been explained. *Nautea* also occurs, but in a different sense, except for the possible exception in Plaut. *Artemo*, which I do not regard as an exception. Paul. Fest. s. v. *nautea*, says: herba granis nigris qua coriarii utuntur, a nave ductum nomen, quia nauseam facit permutatione T in S. No other mention of this plant is found, and it seems to be an invention of the lexicographer; cf. Non. 8. 6 *nautea* est aqua de coriis, vel quod est verius, aqua de sentina, dicta a nautis. *Nautea*, "bilge-water", seems to have become a general term for any bad smell, such as that which is associated with the tanner's trade. Cf. Juv. XIV. 203 *neu credas ponendum aliquid discriminis inter unguenta et corium*, and Mayor's note, who says that tanning and similar offensive trades were restricted to the Transtiberine region. The numerous derivatives in Latin, *nauseare*, *nauseator*, *nauseabundus*, *nauseabilis*, *nauseola*, to which corresponding forms are not found in Greek, always have s.

I would suggest that the forms *nautea* and *nausea* were both taken into Latin with a difference of meaning: both occur in Plautus and the latter only in Plautus, except in the lexicographers; while *sentina* occurs first in Cicero and his contemporaries. *Nautea* was displaced at an early period by *sentina*, and disappeared. The connection between the two meanings of *nautea* and *nausea*, and the loss of the former, are suggested by a passage in the Comment. Einsid. in Gramm. Lat. VIII. 214. 32. K. *inde nausea dicitur vomitus, qui fit propter sentinam*. Had *nautea* then been in use, it would have served better than *sentina* to show the derivation. The meaning of *nausea* was also extended to cover any kind of nausea, physical or mental, and from any cause. Though the derived meaning became more common than the original one, the example from Pliny which is cited above, is the only one I know of in which a qualifying word is used for definiteness; of course the sense of "seasickness" would usually be evident from the context, as indeed it is in the passage from Pliny. Pliny's expression is also unique in using the plural.

As regards the orthography of the Latin words, *nausea* should represent the high Latin, and *nausia* the low Latin form. Keller, Epileg. 383 regards *nauseam* as the spelling of the archetype in Hor. Epod. 9. 35, and he also reads *nauseat* in Epist. I. 1. 93 (a few inferior MSS have *nausiat*). In his note on the former

passage he cites *nausia* as a vulgar form in Petr. 64, but Bücheler reads *nausea* there (codex H has *nausia*) and in 103, where there seems to be no variant reading. *Nausea* is the form used in the standard editions in all the passages cited, including Plautus, the Bell. Afr., and Cicero's letters, except in Seneca. Haase reads *nausia*, *nausiare*, *nausiator*, and *nausiabundus*, and Hense, in his edition of the Epistulae, also reads the forms with *i*, except in 103. 37, where he has *nauseabundus*, which is changed to *nausiabundus* in codex B. Elsewhere I have found no variant readings, except in Plin. N. H. XXVII. 52, where codd. F and V have *nausia*. If the manuscript tradition is correct, it is difficult to understand why Seneca uses the forms with *i*. Considering the predominance of the spelling *nausea* in so many different writers, the preservation of *nauseabundus* and the change to *i* in one manuscript suggest that Seneca also used the forms in *e*, and that they were changed by the scribes. It is noteworthy that there is no example of confusion between *nausea* and *nautea*, a circumstance which adds to the probability of the suggestion made above, that the difference between these two words was not merely one of orthography, but of meaning.¹

JOHN C. ROLFE.

¹Since these notes left my hands, Professor E. B. Clapp, of the University of California, has called my attention to the passage in Plutarch, Aitia Physica, IA', where the question is discussed, Διὰ τι μᾶλλον ναυτιῶσι τὴν θάλατταν πλέοντες ἢ τοὺς ποταμούς, κἂν ἐν γαλήνῃ πλέωσι; Professor F. G. Moore, of Dartmouth, sent me one from Tac. Hist. I. 31 *invalidis adhuc corporibus et placatis animis, quod eos a Nerone Alexandriam praemissos atque inde reversos longa navigatione aegros impensiore cura Galba refoverat*. Here *longa navigatione aegros* would seem to be the effect of *iactatio maritima* doubtless including *nausea*. Another indirect reference which had escaped me is in Juv. VI. 98 ff.

At the last moment I have received from Professor G. D. Kellogg, of Williams, Diodorus Siculus IV. 47. 4 (with reference to the myth of Phrixos and Helle) *διαπλεύσαι γὰρ αὐτόν φασιν οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ νεὼς προτομήν ἐπὶ τῆς πρῶρας ἐχούσης κριοῦ, καὶ τὴν Ἑλλήν δυσφοροῦσαν ἐπὶ τῇ ναυτίᾳ καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἐπὶ τοῦ τοίχου τῆς νεὼς ἐκκύπτουσαν, εἰς τὴν θάλατταν προπεσεῖν*.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Complete Works of John Lyly, now for the first time collected and edited from the earliest Quartos, with Life, Bibliography, Essays, Notes, and Index. By R. WARWICK BOND, M. A. 3 vols. Demy 8vo. Vol. i, pp. xvi, 543; ii, pp. iv, 574; iii, pp. iv, 620; with 3 full-page plates. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1902.

"Four years of continuous and exclusive work", Mr. Bond confesses, have been devoted to the preparation of these comprehensive volumes; and obviously that work, the reader will hasten to add, has been sustained by strength of convictions and inspired by unflagging enthusiasm; it has had a mission behind it, the mission of reclaiming from neglect and ignorance "one of the most distinct of Elizabethans". Mr. Bond puts the matter thus: "These volumes deal, in the first place, with the earliest English writer with an acute sense of form, or, . . . at least with the first who made Englishmen feel that prose was an art; also with the first English novelist, and—though this is a point of quite minor importance—with one of the most admired and conspicuous men of letters of the period 1580–1600. They deal, in the second place, with the first regular English dramatist, the true inventor and introducer of dramatic style, conduct, and dialogue; and, in these respects, the chief master of Shakespeare and (but mainly through the latter) of Ben Jonson, and the attendant host of playwrights. There is no play before Lyly. He wrote eight; and immediately thereafter England produced some hundreds—produced that marvel and pride of the greatest literature in the world, the Elizabethan Drama. What the long infancy of her stage had lacked was an example of form, of art; and Lyly gave it." These statements are destined to receive much attention. Mr. Bond is not disturbed at the prospect, but calmly and confidently asks of the critic only this, that he be thoughtful, and that he study the evidence laid before him.

Whatever modifications of Mr. Bond's judgments may be made,—for surely many will be made,—the obligation to him for the first complete edition of Lyly's works will remain to evoke the gratitude of scholars. Few critics will indeed have a sustained and uniform interest in every department of Lyly's activity, but the complete record thus brought together will more and more lead to that comprehensive view that will make amends for partial and distorted judgments and for belated praise. The inclusion of the anonymous play 'The Maydes Metamorphosis'

('A Warning for Faire Women' is rejected, its attribution to Lyly deserving "no support") will contribute to a closer study of Lyly's manner; and the unsifted appendix of poems (including 'The Bee' (hitherto attributed to the Earl of Essex, but by Bond confidently claimed for Lyly) will also stimulate scrutiny.¹ The editor's determination to give the fullest view of his author is shown in the expenditure of "months of labour" in selecting half a dozen 'Epigrams' from Addit. Ms. 15,227. These will have to be considered by the student of Shakespeare's 'Lucrece' (G. Sarrazin, 'Beiblatt zur Anglia' xv, 98).

But Mr. Bond's volumes are more than mere material for scrutiny and special investigations. It is not the shield of the faithful editor that he relies upon for defence, but he has courageously entered the arena of controversy on every important question connected with the active career of his author. Thus, his "Life" of Lyly is in itself a fine example of an exhaustive study and interpretation of the accessible records, while the "Bibliographical Appendix" is noteworthy for the report of newly discovered records and letters that throw additional light on some periods of Lyly's life, and bring the "Entertainments" claimed for him and his relations with "important folk" into clearer view. Although the "Life" contains much that in detail relates to the works of the author, the editor has evaded no expenditure of labor in reconstructing essays on the chief departments of Lyly's authorship. There is an "Essay on Euphuës and Euphuism", another "On Lyly as a Playwright" (the "Note on Italian Influence in Lyly's Plays" is also to be specially mentioned); "the Marprelate Controversy" is surveyed, appropriately and fully enough, in the "Life." Moreover, there are prefixed to the texts discussions bibliographical and critical, ample in detail and well considered; and following the texts are notes that place Mr. Bond high in the rank of commentators.

The student of Euphuism will naturally turn to Mr. Bond for the most recent complete view of the subject, and he will not be unrewarded. It is, however, undeniably true that Mr. Bond is here not at his best in the rôle of reporter of the work of his predecessors. At this point, unhappily, he has faltered for just a moment, and, in refutation of his own painstaking method, feebly exclaimed against an essay "wherein elaboration reaches a point almost inimical to literary study". Inasmuch as Mr. Bond had previously tried his hand in this matter ('Quarterly Review' for January, 1896), it is all the more surprising that he should now fail in a methodical compilation. External proof of

¹ Mr. H. Littledale has already reclaimed 'The Bee' for Essex, and has further added: "I have studied Mr. Bond's conjectural 'Doubtful Poems' of Lyly very carefully, and the impression they leave on my mind is that not only did Lyly not write a single line of them, but also that it now becomes very much more doubtful than before whether he was capable of writing 'Cupid and my Campaspe'."—'The Athenaeum', Feb. 28, 1903.

looseness of method is at once furnished by the detachment of the "Additional Note" (i, 539); it contains nothing that should not have had an organic place in the "Introductory Essay". It is discoverable that Mr. Bond has here relied too much upon his previous presentation of the subject, and, after that, upon Dr. Landmann's "summarized" and "clarified" paper published by the "New Shakspeare Society". He should have retaken the path through Dr. Landmann's original treatise and that of Mr. Child, conquering his momentary revulsion of feeling to "elaboration" that is "almost inimical to literary study". Throughout his discussion of Euphuism, moreover, Mr. Bond has prepared the reader for what would otherwise have been a real surprise in his note on 'parison' (i, 540). The ancient use of the word (Quintilian, ix, iii, 75) should have saved Mr. Bond from an habitual playing with the mistaken etymological significance of the term; indeed the modern glass-blower might have taught him better. There is, however, an objection that might be urged against the use of 'parison' (adjective) in place of the correctly formed name of the process, 'pariosis' (Volkmann, 'Rhetorik' p. 482; Gerber, 'Die Sprache als Kunst' ii, 135, 140). The old word cancels the demand for such an unshapely coin as 'clause-parallelism'.

In acknowledging the receipt of Macaulay's 'Essay on Milton', Jeffrey wrote to the young author, "The more I think, the less I can conceive where you picked up that style". The subjective elements of a marked style are usually developed by external 'educational' circumstances that are more or less clearly traceable. There is an external history of Lyly's style, and the principal facts are well known; but there is still a division of opinion in detail. Lyly's debt to Pettie is now perhaps duly acknowledged, and Pettie is probably destined to become more intimately known (see 'The Nineteenth Century' for February, 1904); but there is still no agreement in the distribution of honors between Lord Berners and Sir Thomas North, to say nothing of the inadequate study of classical influences. Mr. Bond might easily have contributed more to the determination of results by an exact collation of 'The Golden Book' and 'The Dial'. That North has transferred into 'The Dial' chapters and long passages from 'The Golden Book' (e. g., the first chapter of the Letters, cap. lviii of 'The Dial' is cap. xxvi, 1 of 'The Golden Book'; cap. xxxviii of 'The Golden Book' is cap. lxiii in 'The Dial'; cap. lxviii of 'The Dial' becomes the fourteenth Letter of 'The Golden Book'; cap. lvii of 'The Dial' becomes, in somewhat ampler form however, cap. xlviii of 'The Golden Book'; and cap. lxxv of 'The Dial' becomes the first Letter of 'The Golden Book') should have been completely reported. A thorough comparison of the two works would reveal an agreement in style of which Mr. Bond gives no intimation. Granted that Lyly used North's book rather than Berners', the English source of

the style remains to be determined by the relation of the second translator to the first. Moreover, a collation of the different editions of the original book from which Berners and North made their translations is required, and the difference in the linguistic attainments of the translators should not be neglected.

Mr. Bond's volumes contain so much that will remain valuable for the study of the plays that it is difficult, in a brief notice, to convey a notion of all he has done. His annotations are, of course, not complete. Echoes of Lyly in Shakespeare that have not reached him will from time to time be caught by other ears. The comedy of the master will be brought into clearer relation at many points with that of his clever predecessor because of the way traversed by Mr. Bond. But special attention will be attracted to two questions connected with the plays that are handled by Mr. Bond with marked originality and independence of judgment,—the question of the allegorical interpretation of the 'Endimion', and the question of the dramatic maturity of 'The Woman in the Moone'.

Mr. Baker's conclusion ('Endymion' p. lxxxiv) is "that 'Endymion', with its figures and similes that are the same as figures and similes in both parts of the 'Euphues', was first acted after the publication of the 'Anatomie of Wit' and before the publication of the 'England', but when all of the 'England', except possibly the 'Glass for Europe', had been written for some months". Mr. Child, on the other hand, had seen in the 'Campaspe' features of style that associated it in the closest manner with the 'Euphues'; in the 'Endimion', a later development of the 'Euphuistic' manner. Mr. Bond sustains Mr. Child's judgment, and accordingly places the 'Campaspe' at the head of the chronological list, and the 'Endimion' in the fourth place. But it is with reference to the allegory of the 'Endimion' that Mr. Bond's arguments are most significant. He expounds the allegory in a manner more convincing than that of Mr. Halpin or that of Mr. Baker. The Earl of Leicester remains Endimion, and Queen Elizabeth remains Cynthia; but a radical change of the programme is effected by the substitution of Mary Queen of Scots as the original of Tellus. Well defined limits for the date of the play (May to November, 1585) are thus inferred. The ingenious and usually convincing character of Mr. Bond's argument is finely shown in his method of discovering Sir Amyas Paulet to be the original of Corsites. Paulet was charged with the custody of the Queen of Scots, and in his rigid puritanic honesty rejected his royal prisoner's secret overture for a relaxed watchfulness. "This incident (says Mr. Bond, iii, 92), which affords a parallel for Tellus' deceptive promises to Corsites (iv. i. p. 54), is related by Froude as occurring at the commencement of Paulet's appointment in 1585. Among other details of his guardianship of Mary, Froude relates that when she wished her apartments, which looked upon the castle court, changed to others commanding

a view of the open country, Paulet refused, from a conviction that she would use the opportunity thus afforded to exchange signals with some of the messengers ever on the watch to carry communications to her friends. This detail is probably the suggestion of Tellus' remark—"I maruell Corsites giueth me so much libertie: all the world knowing his charge to bee so high, and his nature to bee so straunge; who hath so ill intreated Ladies of great honour, that he hath not suffered them to *look out of windowes*, much lesse to walke abroad": and her further remark at the end of the scene, 'I will in, and laugh with *the other Ladies* at Corsites sweating', probably has reference to the mischievous enjoyment by Mary and her train of their continual efforts to elude her gaoler's vigilance". Interesting, too, though to a subordinate degree, is Mr. Bond's identification of Sir Philip Sidney (not the Earl of Sussex, as Halpin thought) in the character of Eumenides, and the substitution of Gabriel Harvey for Stephen Gosson as the original of Sir Topas. At every step Mr. Bond is cautious enough not to require too much of the allegory, and finally confesses (iii, 102) that "its weak point is, doubtless, the want of any definite intrigue against Leicester by Mary or Lady Shrewsbury; but the same weakness", he adds, "is inherent in the theory of Mr. Halpin, and in Mr. Baker's emendation of it".

Some of Mr. Bond's judgments concerning 'The Woman in the Moone' will be disputed. It is Lyly's first play in verse,— "The first he had in Phoebus holy bowre", of the Prologus is thus explained. This fact of form has misled Mr. Bond in his comparison of the plays in Euphuistic details. He overestimates it as to construction of plot, as to merit of literary form, and as to the inherent power of the characters, and consequently places it, one must believe, too late in the list (in the seventh place). "Altogether, in spite of some defects", he concludes, "I am inclined to regard 'The Woman' as the cleverest and most original of Lyly's plays: it certainly possesses the largest share of poetic beauty" (ii, 278). But the 'Midas' and the 'Mother Bombie' are surely closer to the "imitation of life", and represent better dramatic art. Mr. Bond has in this instance left a question in a very unsettled state.

An important aspect of Lyly's dramatic art brings into view the theatrical companies of his day. Few dramatists have not been influenced by the players and the conditions of presentation they have had in mind. If, therefore, the plays of Lyly were comprised in the *répertoire* of the St. Paul's Boys, what effect did such Children Companies have upon the dramatist in his preparation of plays? The question is not asked for the first time, nor have the more obvious features of its reply hitherto escaped notice. But there is another aspect of the influence of the Children Companies, and this has perhaps never been surveyed in the full light of all the facts. Lyly's dramatic career

marks the significant central point of view between the petition of the Scholars of St. Paul's addressed to Richard II in 1378 and the Beeston's Boys who continued to play perhaps to the closing of the theatres in 1642 (see A. Albrecht, 'Das englische Kindertheater', Halle, 1883; and Hermann Maas, 'Die Kindertruppen', Bremen, 1901); and many of the most significant complexities in the problem of the development of the regular drama become classified and interpreted by regarding the Children Companies as the result of a second birth of the drama within the church.

With the secularization of the old plays came this new beginning of performances within the church and under its supervision. And it was again in the choir, where the *Quem quaeritis* had begun and gradually grown from antiphonal response through trope and other accretions into the germinal play of the complete cycle, that this second beginning was made—but with a difference; the Scholars of St. Paul's asked for protection against unauthorized presentations of Old Testament history. The choir boys began with dramatic material that was destined to wear out. And the relation of these boys to the schools in time established a relation between the presentations in the churches and those in the schools, and then those at the court and before the academicians. The character of the plays underwent corresponding transformations, and there emerged from these companies the professional player and the essential features of theatrical organization and conduct. How central in all affairs dramatic these companies became is shown by the attention directed to them by "Inhibitions" and in all the controversies respecting theatrical matters, as well as by the attitude towards them on the part of the dramatists. All the women on the stage were impersonated by boys until the Restoration. The Children Companies had served their important purpose.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

A History of French Versification, by L. E. KASTNER, M. A.
Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1903, pp. vi, 312.

The title of Mr. Kastner's book, 'A History of French Versification' is misleading. Professedly based upon Tobler's 'Vom französischen Versbaue'—unfortunately not upon the last edition, as is apparent by a number of omissions—with the subject matter somewhat differently arranged, and at times much expanded, the author has produced a handbook of French poetics, which will be very useful for reference on account of the large number of illustrative examples. But there is not any discussion of the origins of French metres, an omission intentional but not justifiable, for the results of the study of the beginnings of French versification are not so hypothetical as Mr. Kastner seems to think. At the very outset he has failed to give an adequate statement of the

problems of French versification, and in the course of the whole book there is no attempt on the part of the author to trace the development of certain tendencies, which in many cases made the exception become the rule.

From the categorical arrangement of the examples, a novice would get the idea that there had been numerous variations from, and infringements of, certain established metrical rules, but he would look in vain for an account of the principles of the various schools of poetry, the Classic, Romantic, Parnassian and Symbolistic schools, or a statement of the reasons why each successive school revolted from the preceding school, and formulated its own rules. The author may have acted wisely in avoiding the use of the standard French manual but he should certainly have known such books as Sully Prudhomme's 'Reflexions sur l'art des vers', Eichthal's 'Question du rythme dans le vers français' and Kahn's 'Palais Nomades', which were the manifestoes of the doctrines of the several schools to which the writers belonged. But then, most of the recent books and articles on various phases of the subject are simply ignored in the elective bibliography, which heads the book.

A number of misstatements and omissions should be noted. In speaking of the elision of the mute *e* in the enclitic *le* (p. 6) the phrase "after the verb" should have been added, and mention made of the fact that the rule applied in Old French to the other enclitic pronouns, no longer in use. The *i* can be elided in the conjunction *si* but not in the adverb (p. 6). Why are not examples given from the symbolists of elision in the verbal forms *t'es, t'as* (p. 13)? Not "a few", but many examples of mute *-ent* are found in the poets of the early seventeenth century (p. 16). The subjunctive *aies* is regularly counted as only one syllable in modern poetry (p. 18). *Rimes gasconnes, normandes, de Chartres* put under different headings by Mr. Kastner (pp. 72, 75), all represent the same phenomenon, the assimilation of the *ö* sound to the *ü* sound. (Cp. K. Nyrop, *Grammaire hist.* vol. I p. 163). Moreover the rime word *meure* is wrongly cited from Villon as an example of this phenomenon (p. 75), as the Latin form **mora* developed regularly in Old French into *meure*, which under the influence of the adjective *mûr* and the substantive *mûrier* became *mûre* in modern French.

The explanation of the dialectical rimes, *aigne: agne: eigne: egne* (p. 73), is meaningless, and the present pronunciation of Montaigne, far from being a relic of this phenomenon, is due to a dialectical spelling of the name Montagne, which was pronounced with *añ* in the last syllable. In order to explain the rimes *Brute: juste; dextre: maistre* in sixteenth century poets, the author states that "Modern French has sometimes (in its wish to approximate to Latin pronunciation) reintroduced letters silent before the seventeenth century",—an explanation which does not explain. Writers of the sixteenth century often made merely

orthographical changes in order to assimilate French words to their primitive Latin forms. Certain of these words came to be pronounced in Modern French as they are spelled as was the case with *juste*, but with none of the others cited. It should have been noted that the mute *e* in the epic cesura comes after the fourth accented syllable, while the mute *e* of the lyric cesura comes after the third accented syllable (pp. 84, 87), and the fact should have been mentioned that there is a choice of only fifteen possible rhythms in the Romantic system (p. 94), to the thirty-six in the classical system. In the discussion of classical versification there is no mention of the important rules in regard to two rests in succession, and the avoidance of a rest on the seventh syllable when there is no rest on the sixth (p. 89). In the chapter entitled "The So-called Poetic Licenses", there is no discussion of actual licenses such as ellipses, etc. There are numerous omissions in the account of "Certain Fixed Forms", and by following Tobler too closely Mr. Kastner has failed to include the experiments of the symbolists in his survey of rimeless poetry.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

Greek Sculpture: Its Spirit and Principles. By EDMUND VON MACH, Ph. D. Ginn & Co., 1904.

Dr. von Mach's Greek Sculpture is a welcome addition to the books on Greek art which have appeared in recent years. The book is an octavo volume of upward of three hundred pages and not too heavy to use easily. It has many plates scattered through it and about forty more at the end. To supplement these an atlas with about five hundred further illustrations is to be issued shortly.

The book in general may be described as a series of essays on Greek sculpture, rather than a history of Greek sculpture, and in this respect it differs from the other well-known histories of Greek art. The chief object of the author is to lead the reader to a proper appreciation of the aesthetic qualities of the works which he discusses, and in this he is most successful. In fact the book is much stronger on what may be termed its artistic, as opposed to its archaeological side.

In a book of this kind there must necessarily be many places where opinions will differ. It is a satisfaction to see the author assert, what is undoubtedly true, that Greek sculpture was Greek from the beginning and not due to outside influences, although this is a conclusion which probably many persons are not yet ready to accept. To take another case: Dr. von Mach will probably find few to agree with him when he declares that the Achermos inscription and the winged figure from Delos do not belong together. It is true that Wolters once held this view,

but it is shared in by few other archaeologists. Again: the author also denies the connection of the Antenor base and the female figure which stands upon it in the Acropolis Museum. There is a chance here for an honest difference of opinion, but if Dr. von Mach could compare a cast of the top of the base with the lower part of the statue perhaps he would be more ready to believe that the two belong together.

One misses a chapter on the Sidon sarcophagi, and another on the Attic grave reliefs, but the author no doubt wishes to confine himself as far as possible to the works of the great masters. The chapter on material, technique, etc., might be enlarged with profit without materially increasing the size of the book.

In this book Dr. von Mach has done a real service to the study of Greek art. Students of archaeology are too apt to forget artistic appreciation in the discussion of archaeological detail. This the book aims to correct, and in this it differs from other available handbooks. It thus has a field of its own.

The misprints are few. Note 'Reissner', page 325 and in the index, for 'Reisner'. Errors in proper names are especially irritating.

WILLIAM N. BATES.

1. Asser's Life of King Alfred, together with the Annals of St. Neots erroneously ascribed to Asser. Edited, with introduction and commentary, by WILLIAM HENRY STEVENSON, M. A. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1904. cxxx, 386.

We at last have a critical edition of Asser's Life of King Alfred, which Mr. Stevenson pronounces "one of the great *desiderata* of our early historical literature". An introduction of 131 pages is followed by the text of 96 pages. Then comes an appendix of 50 pages containing the Annals of St. Neots,—20 pages of introduction and 30 of text,—followed by about 200 pages of Notes on Asser's Life of King Alfred and 40 pages of an index of proper names. After a very thorough and laborious study of the work Mr. Stevenson's conclusion is stated as follows in the Preface (p. vii): "The net result has been to convince me that, although there may be no very definite proof that the work was written by Bishop Asser in the lifetime of King Alfred, there is no anachronism or other proof that it is a spurious compilation of later date". The introduction comprises the following sections: 1. History of the text; 2. Description of the lost MS; 3. The transcripts; 4. Excerpts from the work in later compilers; 5. The author, Internal evidence of the text; 6. The attacks upon the authenticity of the work; 7. Summary.

The work is full of interpolations, made by Archbishop Parker, chiefly from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Annals of St. Neots, one of the most noted of which is the familiar story of

"the cakes", taken from the *Annals of St. Neots*. Mr. Stevenson calls this "the most famous of the passages foisted into the *Life of Parker*" (p. 256), of which he says: "More mischief has been wrought by Parker's interpolation of this long passage than by any of his other falsifications of historic evidence". Mr. Stevenson is sustained in his view of the genuineness of the *Life* by Pauli and Ebert vs. Wright and others, and he has devoted some thirty pages to a consideration of the charges that have been brought against the work. He says: "We have thus examined the charges brought against the *Life*, and we have not found one dealing with facts that support the view that the work is of later origin than it pretends to be"; and further: "In the course of a microscopical examination of the work we have failed to discover anything that can be called an anachronism". . . . "This absence of anachronism is an argument in favour of the authenticity of the work". Neither Pauli nor Ebert thinks that the *Life* has come down to us in its original form, but Mr. Stevenson considers that "both writers are probably influenced in part by the gross interpolations of Parker". He gives the date of composition of the *Life* as "six years only before the death of the King", i. e., 895 A. D., and says that there are "several features that point to its being composed at least as early as the first half of the tenth century", and that are "compatible with an earlier date". The unique Cottonian MS was entirely destroyed in the great fire of 1731; "the oldest hand dated from about the year 1000 or 1001", and "the later hand cannot have been later in date than the eleventh century". Francis Wise published a facsimile of the MS in 1722, nine years before the fire, and this is our chief authority for the text. He had the authority of the noted scholar, Humphrey Wanley, for the date, and it was he that "assigned the first and earliest hand of the MS to about the year 1000 or 1001", as given above. Archbishop Parker bequeathed a transcript to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge,—the most valuable one,—and there are other transcripts in the British Museum, in the Cambridge University Library, and in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Mr. Stevenson states that "the text has been established by a minute collation of the existing transcripts and editions and of the early compilers who embody matter derived from this work", the most valuable of whom is Florence of Worcester (died A. D. 1118), then the author of the so-called *Annals of St. Neots*,—*not* Asser,—who slavishly copied his originals, then Simeon of Durham. Mr. Stevenson has evidently done his work very carefully and thoroughly, and in such manner that it will not need to be done over again. Scholars are greatly indebted to him for rehabilitating Asser.

Because of the relation of the *Annals of St. Neots* to the *Life of Alfred*, Mr. Stevenson prints the text of that work, and prefixes an introduction treating "1. Character of the work;

2. Origin of name; 3. Probably an East Anglian compilation; 4. Date of compilation; 5. Use of Frankish sources; 6. English sources; 7, 8. Version of O. E. Chronicle employed; 9-11. Relations with Florence of Worcester; 12. Compiler does not use William of Malmesbury or Geoffrey of Monmouth; 13. Use of the work by later compilers; 14-16. Description of unique MS; 17. Early transcripts; 18. Previous editions".

The passages drawn from the Life of Alfred and other well-known sources are merely indicated, and these, with the translations from the O. E. Chronicle, "constitute by far the greater part of the work". "Nothing is known of the compiler or of the date or place of the compilation". The work is not continued beyond A. D. 914, and the use of Norman sources proves that it is later than the Conquest, probably later than the year 1104. "The English sources used in the compilation are Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, the Chronicle, the Life of Alfred, Abbo of Fleury's 'Passion of St. Edmund', a life of St. Æthelberht, King of East Anglia, and a life of St. Neot. The text of the latter has not come down to us, but the verses quoted from it occur in a twelfth-century MS life of this saint". These are the verses quoted in the Life of Alfred containing the excoriation of the King by the cowherd's wife in the matter of "the cakes",—referred to above,—and run as follows (p. 41 of the Life):

"Heus homo

urere, quos cernis, panes gyrare moraris,
cum nimium gaudes hos manducare calentes".

It is a pity that we do not know the name of the author of these hexameters, for a literary reputation has sometimes been based on much less foundation.¹

The compiler of these Annals "makes extensive use of the Life of Alfred, embodying nearly the whole of it". Only one MS of the work is known, formerly belonging to Archbishop Parker, and at present in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. A transcript made for the use of Parker is among his MSS at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and an edition was printed from the Trinity College MS at Oxford in 1691 by Thomas Gale, hence its rarity deserved this reprint.

2. *The Making of English*. By HENRY BRADLEY. New York and London. The Macmillan Company, 1904.

The title of this book is attractive, and when introduced by the name of Dr. Henry Bradley, one of the editors of the Oxford English Dictionary, it was reasonable to expect that we at last had an elementary text-book on its subject which could be confidently commended to school-teachers. I regret to have to say that the result is disappointing. This may be due, in part,

¹ Mr. Stevenson says that "we have no evidence of the existence of this story of Alfred and the cakes before the Norman Conquest."

as Dr. Bradley says in his Preface, "to the desultory manner in which it has been composed", but the only answer to such an excuse is that it was not necessary to compose it. It would take too much space in this Journal to enumerate specific objections. Even "educated readers unversed in philology",—for whom it is intended,—should have a more scientific and systematic treatment of the subject than we find here. It does not lessen the difficulties of a subject to ignore scientific order and arrangement, and to throw together "desultory" essays, however true may be the statements made in them.

It is scarcely correct, from the standpoint of modern philology, to say (p. 35): "Old English had many declensions of substantives". This is going back to the days of Rask and his followers. To say nothing of German and American studies, it disregards the works of Dr. Morris, Professor Skeat, and Mr. Sweet. Too much is made of "the complicated system of strong verbs", and the statement is made that "it remains just as intricate as it was in Old English". It is easily enough understood if it is arranged on a scientific system, but where no help is given to understand it, no wonder it is called "complicated" and "intricate".

In the chapter on "Word-Making in English", many illustrations are drawn from "made-up" words, as *fairation* (p. 137), *dodder* (p. 159), etc., but these are scarce in actual English. The "general reader", ignorant of the subject, may be edified by this book, but the teacher will find it hard to use the book in instruction.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

REPORTS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN.

A considerable number of excellent studies and reviews are to be found in the later volumes; at the same time certain tendencies of the periodical will hardly be admired by its more scholarly readers. At present the field of discussion extends from original research in the English language and literature to *Neuere Erzählungsliteratur*, *Neue Romane*, *Unterrichtswesen*, even including articles on the Boer War and educational acts in England. Breadth of interest is excellent, but it should be distinguished from dissipation of effort. The quality of work in *Englische Studien* is notably unequal, and falls off especially in articles of popular nature. Popular articles give opportunity for skillful, and even noble workmanship, but they cannot exactly be said to lessen the provincial character of a journal ostensibly devoted to a branch of philology; and when they fail to improve upon Baildon's concluding article on Stevenson (Volume XXVIII) they are intolerable. There is small excuse, too, for such negligence in the matter of proof-reading as appears on nearly every page.

Volume XXXI. 1. Förster. *Early Middle English Proverbs*. An edition of nineteen proverbs found in MS II 45, Trinity College, Cambridge, and printed in the first edition of Kemble's rare *Salomon and Saturnus*. The proverbs are in Latin, with Middle English, and, in a few cases, Old French parallels. The date of the collection is about 1200, though several of the proverbs are doubtless much older. It was compiled apparently in Southern Central England, and has traits in common with the so-called *Proverbs of Alfred* and the *Owl and the Nightingale*. Several of the proverbs are pure specimens of the Old English long line, chiefly of the A type; others illustrate the verse of Layamon. The editor has cited numerous interesting parallels in his notes, besides compiling a glossary, and furnishing bibliographical material on the subject of Early English proverbs. He adds four proverbs from MS Digby 53, and two from MS Rawlinson C 641, printed by P. Meyer and Stengel.

Knapp. *The Diffusion of the Inflected Genitive in -s in Middle English*. Knapp discusses the subject under the following heads: *Die Flexion des Genitivs in Altnorthumbrischen*; *Der Genitiv Singularis im Späteren Sächsischen*; *Der Nördliche [Middle English] Dialekt*; *Der Norden des Östlichen Mittel-landes*; *Chaucer, Londoner Urkunden, Caxton*; *Das Westliche Mittelland*; *Der Westliche und Mittlere Süden*; *Kent und die*

Benachbarten Südöstl.-Sächs. Gebiete; Der Genitiv Pluralis; Ursachen der Entwicklung; Wegfall des Suffixes nach Zischlauten und vor *s* des Folgenden Wortes; Der Genitiv der Verwandtschaftsnamen auf *-r*; Eigennamen und Personennamen mit Endungslosem Genitiv Singularis; Ausdruck des Possessiven Verhältnisses durch das dem Substantiv nachgestellte Possessivpronomen *his*; Der Genitiv in der Zusammensetzung. Arising, as it did, in Old Northumbrian, the dissemination of the genitive in *-s* is explained chiefly by a failing sense of grammatical gender, by the leveling of the inflection of the article and the adjective, and by its phonetic convenience. In the South the circumlocution with *of*, among other causes, tended to retard its increase. The study is abundantly illustrated from a rather wide range of Middle English literature.

Holthausen. *Studies in Early English Drama*. A reprint of two Latin dialogues of Ravisius Textor from an edition of 1651. These dialogues are the sources respectively of the interlude Thersites, and Ingelend's interlude, *The Disobedient Child*. The author remarks briefly upon the relation of these plays to their originals.

Among the reviews may be mentioned the following: Trautmann, *Kleine Lautlehre des Deutschen, Französischen, und Englischen*, reviewed by Logeman; Malmstedt, *Studies in English Grammar*, by Stoffel; Reitterer, *Leben und Werke Peter Pindar's*, by Machule; Gaebel, *Beiträge zur Technik der Erzählung in den Romanen Scott's*, by Schnabel.

The Miscellanea include *Bemerkungen und Zusätze zu Franz' Shakespeare Grammatik* by Ellinger; a note on *Always = at any rate*, by Swaen; a note from Lange opposing Skeat's theory that the Romance of the Rose, B, was translated by James I. of Scotland.

2. Weyrauch. *The Squyr of Lowe Degre*. A brief discussion of Turk's study of this romance. The author supports him in his belief that the romance is not, like *Sir Thopas*, a travesty.

Machule. *Coleridge's Translation of Wallenstein*. An account of its origin drawn from such sources as Schiller's correspondence, and a detailed comparison of the translation with the original. Certain variations, or additions, sometimes thought to have been original with Coleridge, are due to the fact that he used a MS version sent him by Schiller, which differs slightly from the text published in Germany. This version is that of the Stuttgarter Theaterhandschrift, published by Von Maltzahn in 1861.

Jespersen. *The Nasal in Nightingale*. This intrusive nasal is not due to the associative influence of the word *evening* (cf. Sweet N. E. G. § 1551), but is the same as that in *Portyngale*

<Portugal, porringer <porrager, and a dozen other examples. Jespersen deduces the rule that 'a nasal was very often inserted before *g* or *d* in the weakly stressed middle syllable of a trisyllable stressed on the first syllable'. The insertion in most cases occurred in late Middle English.

Reviews. The important ones are as follow: Finck's *Die Klassifikation der Sprachen*, and Osthoff's *Etymologische Parerga*, both by Uhlenbeck, the latter containing some five pages of detailed comment and correction; Kaluza's *Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache*, which Pogatscher finds hasty, inaccurate, and ill-adapted to the student's needs; he adds numerous minor observations; Pound's *Comparison of English Adjectives in the XV. and XVI. centuries*, by Stoffel; the sixth edition of Zupitza's *Lesebuch*, by Holthausen; Sedgefield's edition of King Alfred's *Boethius*, reviewed in detail by Wülfing, though a considerable proportion of the matter is irrelevant.

The Miscellanea include a lexicological note fully illustrated, by Sattler, on *Most—the Most* and an explanation, by Berg of the terms *gentlemen of the professions* and *college*, as used in *The Rivals*.

3. Van Draat, *The Loss of the Prefix ge- in the Modern English Verb*. The history of the prefix in Germanic down to Old English was somewhat as follows: As a prepositional prefix it first denoted combination, then became intensive, then a mere symbol transforming an imperfective verb into a perfective or resultative. Thus it comes to indicate tense in Old English, and naturally becomes a distinguishing mark of the perfect participle. In a number of cases, however, cited from Alfred's *Orosius*, the collective force is apparent, and in a still greater number (from the same text) *ge-* distinguishes the perfective meaning of a verb from the imperfective meaning of the simple verb form. In later English *ge-* has been lost, chiefly owing to French influence, and the simple verb compelled to do duty both in the imperfective and perfective senses. A list of such cases is appended. The author's distinctions seem confused at times, and his cited examples represent little literature beyond the *Orosius* and some thirty verses of the Old English Gospels in the four various manuscripts.

Nesbitt. On Some Difficulties in Learning English.

Ruete. Otto Gildemeister. An obituary account of the editor of the *Weserzeitung*, and translator into German of Byron, Shakespeare, Ariosto, and Dante. In his essays he is strongly influenced by Macaulay.

Reviews. Björkman speaks enthusiastically of Callaway's study of the appositive participle in Old English. Furnivall's *editio princeps* of Lydgate's *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man* is re-

viewed by Logeman, who is not convinced that Bunyan was directly dependent upon it, though the two allegories may have a common source. Boyle, in his usual violent manner, falls foul of Thorndike's *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*, and, oddly enough, blames him for his 'inclination to sneer', for 'a tone of unprovoked aggressiveness', and for 'dealing his blows furiously right and left'. Elton commends, for its thoroughness and learning, Ker's edition of select essays by Dryden.

Miscellanea. Bang maintains that *A* in *A Talbot*, I. Henry VI. I. 1. 123, is an interjection.

A Supplementheft contains a Generalregister to Volumes I-XXV of *Englische Studien*, compiled by Arthur Kölbing.

Volume XXXII. 1. Heuser, A New Middle English Version of the Theophilus Legend. This is the late XV. century version found in the Bodleian MS Rawlinson Poetr. 225, and here printed for the first time. A Southern and a Northern version of this mediæval Faust legend are already in print, but a fourth (Harl. 1703) is still unpublished. This version, in six-line tail-rime stanzas Heuser considers the most artistic.

Bruce. The Breaking of the Deer in Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight. In this very interesting article the author explains the obscure description, found in Sir Gawayne, of this event of the chase. This he does with the aid of descriptions of the process found in mediæval English and French texts. They are as follows: Sir Tristrem 474 ff.; Parlement of the Thre Ages 65 ff.; Boke of St. Albans, and a XVII. century version of it called Jewell for Gentry; a tract in Cott. MS Vesp. B XII. (translated from Twici's *Art de Venerie*); Chace dou Cerf (late XIII. century); Le Livre du Roy Modus (1300); La Chasse de Gaston Phoebus (1387).

Lawrence. Some Characteristics of the Elizabethan-Stuart Stage. The author first attacks the false doctrine that the Elizabethan theatre had a drop curtain; he then distinguishes between two kinds of public theatre—those in which the stage was permanent, being covered with a permanent roof supported by columns; and those which could be quickly converted into a bear-garden by the removal of the stage. In the latter case there was only a light roof and no columns. Van Buchell's famous contemporary drawing of the Swan combines columns with a movable stage, and is therefore inaccurate. Lawrence discusses also the position and use of the lower traverses. They hung between the doors at the rear of the stage, and confined a small portion of the stage-room, which served in many cited instances as an inner room and the like. Traces of this expedient survived in the drama until nearly 1700, long after the device had vanished.

Pughe. Matthew Arnold as Critic of his Age and Social Reformer (continued on p. 200 of this volume). A voluble, but not especially discriminating paraphrase of material in Walker's Greater Victorian Poets, Saintsbury's Arnold, Gate's Selections from Arnold's Prose, Stedman's Victorian Poets, and the same writer's Matthew Arnold.

Eitrem. Stress in English Verb-and-Adverb Groups (cf. Sweet's N. E. G. II, §§1907, 1908). A classification of the various cases in contemporary English in which the stress falls upon the adverb, upon the verb, or upon both equally. The article may be useful as a record of contemporary sentence-accent, or to an adult foreigner in his study of English.

Reviews. Holthausen's notice of the coöperative Laut- und Formenlehre der Altgermanischen Dialekte, edited by Dieter, contains nearly seven pages of detailed corrections. Glöde praises Fehr's Die Formelhaften Elemente in den Alten Englischen Balladen, I, as a good example of an analytic study of style. The best review of the number is by Van Dam, dealing with Bridges' Milton's Prosody and Stone's Classical Metres in English Verse. He shows that Bridges is wrong in disregarding the pronunciation of Milton's time, and that such disregard vitiates his entire treatment of the subject of elision. Furthermore his conception of stress is crude. The exceptional cases of inverted stress in both the first and the second foot of Par. Lost VI. 34; XI. 79, are perhaps due to unconscious imitations of Italian hendecasyllabics. An instance occurs in Milton's Italian Sonnet II. 13.

Miscellanea. Swaen continues his notes in Old English Lexicography. Ritter contributes ten Literarhistorische Miscellen, among which may be mentioned two XVIII. century examples of Cupid and Death as a lyric motive; a comparison of Measure for Measure III. 1. 32 ff. and Lear I. 2, with a Latin version of Anthol. Graec. I. 66. 1, and with a song in Kendall's Flowers of Epigrammes; a comparison of Gray's Agrippina 98 with Night Thoughts 258, 261; notes on Chatterton's Ælla, Cowper's Task I. 749, Byron's To Mary, Shelley's Adonais, and the following poems of Burns: Song composed in August, A Winter Night, Captain Grose's Peregrinations, Thou Ling'ring Star, The Cares o' Love, From Esopus to Maria 23.

2. Osthoff. Ags. *Blāce*, *Blācðrustfel*. Etymologists have in many cases assumed *blāc* to be a variant of *blāc*. T. E. Karsten has shown that the nom. masc. form should be *blāce*, not *blāc*. These collateral forms arose as a result of the -u:-io-inflection of the adjective. Sweet derived his nominative *blāc* from the gloss *blāc thrustfel* (*vitiligo*, leprosy). The author believes, however, that the gloss should be printed *blāc-ðrustfel*, which is probably analogous with **blāc-ðrustfel*, just as *blāc-ern*

is analogous with *blāc-ern*; therefore *blāc*, as a nominative form is not correctly inferred. Osthoff adds one or two corollary remarks.

Ackermann. Lord Byron's Betrothal, Marriage, and Divorce. A reply to exceptions taken by Brandl to the author's conclusions in a review of Ackermann's Life of Byron. The review was printed in the Deutsche Lit. Zeitung 1901, 3040-3041.

Lamburn. The Education Act of 1902 for England and Wales.

Reviews. Franz speaks with much greater approval of the second part of Kaluza's Historische Grammatik than Pogatscher did of the first. He corrects a few errors of detail. A review by Spies, in twenty-four pages, of Macaulay's edition of Gower is somewhat spiritless, though scrupulously detailed. The edition he finds a useful makeshift, though not critical in the best sense.

Miscellanea: Hempl, The Runic Words, Hickes 135; Van der Gaaf, The Devil and his Dam (Marlowe, Faustus l. 716, ed. Merm.); Sprenger, April Fool Day. Apropos of Havelok 1006, Van der Gaaf shows that a parliament was held at Lincoln as early as 1226; Holthausen's edition dates the earliest one in 1301. Boyle suggests that the farmer with the expectation of plenty, in Macbeth ii. 3, is Sordido of Jonson's Every Man out of his Humor.

3. Eckhardt. Diminutive Forms in Old English. The arrangement and clearness of this article are admirable. Old English is comparatively feeble in its formation and use of diminutives. Besides the purely diminutive endings, and those which form pet-names and names of the young of animals, there are certain suffixes which have lost their original diminutive force. Under separate heads the author deals with the following suffixes: *ing*, *ling*; *l* (*el*, *la*, *le*), *k* (*ca*, *ce*, *oc*, *uc*, *ic*, *ec*); *in*, *en*; dental suffix; *incel* (not of Latin origin); and certain anomalous cases. A large number of the names of persons are diminutive, at least in form. In Old English versions of Latin Texts the diminutive is seldom rendered by a corresponding Old English diminutive. It is either ignored or paraphrased.

Belden. Perfective *ge-* in Old English *Bringan* and *Gebringan*. *Bringan*, though perfective in Gothic and Old High German, has become durative in Old English and takes *on* with the accusative. A new perfective is found with *ge-* which takes *on* with the dative (in Alfred). This verb also fades into a durative in late Old English, according to the general tendency in Germanic.

Van Draat. The Loss of the Prefix *ge-* in the Modern English Verb. Continued from Volume XXXI. In the first section of this paper the author distinguished eight various constructions with *since*. Each of these he illustrates with examples from Old, Middle, and Modern English. Three have now died out.

Reviews. Wyld's long review of R. Müller's study *Über die Namen des Nordhumbrischen Liber Vitae* is chiefly occupied with the subject of *ð* and *ǣ* before a nasal in Old English. His remarks are inconclusive.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD, JR.

HERMES, XXXVIII.

Fascicle 1.

Vergil's *erste und neunte Ecloge* (F. Leo). L. again (cf. A. J. P. XXIV p. 344) defends Vergil's Eclogues. Published when the poet was nearly 30 years old, we should expect to find in them the ripe fruit of his genius. There is little need of condoning faults, and comprehension is possible without the aid of Theocritus or the aid of allegory, which has been overdone. Eclogue I, indeed, expresses V. gratitude to Octavian for the peaceful possession of his Mantuan estate, and has pictured the distress of the dispossessed settlers; but Tityrus is not Vergil, Servius and modern commentators, notably Bethe (Rh. Mus. XLVII p. 578 ff.), notwithstanding. The latter, starting with this hypothesis, has pointed out discrepancies that tend to show a lack of unity in the composition; but these difficulties yield to a proper interpretation. The same is true in general of Eclogue IX. Here Menalcas is Vergil; but the correspondence is veiled and the other points of contact with V. life are fewer than is commonly believed and unnecessary to the reader. Above all we should recognize that Eclogue IX, apart from the Theocritean verses, is an original production.

Eine Elegie des Gallus (R. Bürger). Theocritus' dying Daphnis was Vergil's model for Eclogue X, which was suggested by an elegy of Gallus. What was the nature of this elegy? Apollo's speech (vv. 21-23) corresponds closely with that of Priapus (Theocr. I 81 ff.) excepting that Vergil, following the scholia to Theocritus, represents Gallus' Lycoris as false to her lover. The substitution of Apollo for Priapus is due to Gallus, who probably introduced Apollo in a dream as Lygdamus did; the dream motive was common to elegy. In sharp contrast with Apollo's words, made cruel through Vergil's misconception, follow those of the hopeful Gallus. These are paraphrased from a single elegy of G., as Servius' *translati* is not to be taken literally and it is not likely that the repeated allusions to the chase would be found in different poems, the chase being rarely mentioned in elegy. The words (v. 2) '*quae legat ipsa Lycoris*' show that Gallus was still writing love songs to Lycoris. This imaginary character became the prototype of the Cynthias and Corinnas of the other elegiac poets, as Gallus himself suggested the model lover. Vergil made use of this elegy just as Ovid drew on Tibullus (Am. III 9); hence biographical details are not to be

looked for. The identification of Lycoris with Cytheris was due to the misconception alluded to above. If Eclogue X, the latest, shows us Gallus as an elegiac poet, it becomes evident that Eclogue VI 64 ff. does not represent a change of G. to an epic poet. Indeed the translations from Euphorion, such as that of the Grynian grove, would naturally precede the original elegiacs, on which Gallus' reputation rests.

Die Senatssitzung vom 14. Jan. 56 (W. Sternkopf). A discussion of Cicero *ad fam.* I 2. 2. leads to the adoption of *ut* after *aperte*, where M shows *vi* crossed out. Changing the usual punctuation we are to read: Perspiciebant enim in Hortensi sententiam multis partibus plures ituros, quamquam aperte, <ut> Volcacio adsentirentur, multi rogabantur, atque id ipsum consulibus invitis, nam ei Bibuli sententiam valere cupierunt (or cupierant Madvig).

ὄλοχύται (P. Stengel). L. Ziehen has shown (cf. A. J. P. XXIV p. 471) the cathartic signification of the ὄλοχύται for post-Homeric times. In Homer water cleanses the hands and fire burns the sacrificial meat; later the burning stick is plunged in water, and altar and worshipers are sprinkled, a symbolism which arose with the post-Homeric belief in pollution. In Euripides' Iph. Aul. 1563 ff. Calchas lays his φάσγανον, before using it, on the basket with οὐλαί as an act of purification. In Homeric times this was unnecessary (cf. Γ 271 ff. and Τ 252 ff.). The rite of the ὄλοχύται was part of the κατάρχεσθαι. We read γ 445 Νέστωρ χερνιβά τ' ὄλοχύτας τε κατήρχετο, which means χερνιψάμενος οὐλοχύτας (ἀνείλετο καὶ) προῦβάλετο. The casting forward was the essential act, and while the οὐλαί would naturally fall on altar and sacrificial animal, it was not for the sake of purification. The companions of Odysseus (μ 357 ff.) pick leaves οὐ γὰρ ἔχον κρὶ λευκόν. Leaves certainly had no purifying virtue. Penelope (δ 759 ff.) goes into the ὑπερῶα and ἐν δὲ θέτ' ὄλοχύτας κανέω, ἥρατο δ' Ἀθήνη. After the prayer we read: ὥς εἰποῦσ' ὀλόλυξε. As this was the customary cry at offerings to attract the attention of the god, we may infer that it was accompanied by the sprinkling of the οὐλαί. A man in her place would have poured out wine. The ceremony of the οὐλαί then was a sacrifice, usually preliminary, performed to attract the attention of the god and win his favor, just as wine was poured out for the same purpose.

Paralipomena zu Euklid (J. L. Heiberg).

Zu Clemens Τίς ὁ σωιζόμενος πλούσιος (E. Schwartz).

Stilicho und Alarich (Th. Mommsen). The relations of the two Roman empires, nominally under Arcadius and Honorius, but actually governed by Rufinus Stilicho and others, is set forth on the basis of the historical sources with particular reference to Illyricum, the eastern provinces of which were claimed for the Western Empire by Stilicho. In this connection the warfare

and treaties between Stilicho and Alaric are discussed down to the death of the former. Stilicho held his position as generalissimo through his relationship to the imperial family, though he seems to have been more of a statesman than a general; and remained faithful to the trust the dying Theodosius had imposed on him and made no attempt to dethrone Honorius.

Das neugefundene Bruchstück der capitulinischen Fasten (Th. Mommsen). The restored text of the two columns, for the years 380 B. C. and 332-330 B. C., are given according to Hülsen's publication (Lehmann's Beiträge z. alt. Gesch. 2 (1902), 248.) and compared with the respective data in Livy and Diodorus. The names of seven of the nine military tribunes in column I seem to have arisen from the careless combination of two lists containing six names each, the maximum number; the last two are really names of censors as shown by Livy, who appears to be somewhat more accurate. The identity of the names given in both columns and their genealogies are then discussed.

Bruchstücke der Saliarischen Priesterliste (Th. Mommsen). Built into the church S. Saba on the Aventine this stone contains five names, already known, of a patrician college of ephebi; and as no other such college is known except that of the Salians this list of the years 37-40 A. D. may therefore be added to those of the years 170-202 A. D. long ago recognized as belonging to the college of Palatine Salians, all of which helps to identify another list of the years 56-64 A. D. as being of the same character.

Zu den attischen Archonten des III. Jahrhunderts (J. Beloch). B. defends his chronology of the Attic archons against J. Kirchner (cf. A. J. P. XXIV p. 472). Arrheneides, however, must be moved down to 262/1 B. C. This substantiates the statement of Diod. XXIII 6 (cf. Suidas *Φιλήμων*) concerning the death of Philemon. The hypothesis of a cycle of 19 years gains in credibility and is valuable as a criterion.

Zur Überlieferung von Statius' *Silvae* (Fr. Vollmer). V. believing with Krohn and Klotz that the *Matritensis* (M) discovered by Löwe, is the oldest and only source for the *Silvae* is wholly opposed to Engelmann (*De Statii silvarum codicibus*, Diss. Leipzig 1902) and Wachsmuth (Leipz. Studien XX 202 ff.), who argue that the collation of Poliziano was made from the famous Poggio MS.

Ἐκατόρυγος (Br. Keil). Modern travellers have noted the checkerboard appearance of a large part of the Tauric Chersonesus, marked off by stone fences. This receives light from an inscription of the III century B. C. (Inscr. Pont. Eux. IV n. 80) in which Ἐκατόρυγος, abbreviated from Ἐκατοῦντάρυγος, originally modifying κλῆρος, designated a rectangular plot of ground. Such units combined would constitute farms of various sizes.

Miscellen.—H. Schrader finds that as Minucianus was the first to treat of the 13 *στάσεις* (cf. Syrianus II p. 55, 2 R.) Telephos must either have followed him (150–155 A. D.) at an advanced age, which involves difficulties, or this subject was wrongly attributed to him in the Proleg. to the *στάσεις* of Hermogenes (Walz VII, 1, p. 5, 23) (cf. A. J. P. XXIV 474).—S. Selivanov supported by F. Hiller von Gaertringen shows that five not six was the number of *πρυτάνεις* at Rhodes in the III century B. C.—W. Radtke approves of Kaibel's explanation of Cratinus' verse (II p. 88 M.) *τυρῶ καὶ μίνθῃ παραλεξιμένος καὶ ἐλαίῳ* "dici videtur piscis aliquis caseo mentha oleo conditus tamquam cum Mintha concubuisse"; but includes Tyro in the allusion (λ 235 f.) and adds "quem iocum ut satis absolvat et explanet, poeta extremo versu subiungit sine ulla ambiguitate καὶ ἐλαίῳ."—Mommson derives *iumentum* from *iuvare*. *Iouxmenta* on the archaic cippus of the Roman Forum (Lehmann Beiträge zur alten Gesch. 2 (1902) p. 232) is therefore unintelligible. The word *regei* in the same inscription points to the time of the kings; the letter R can be matched only in the Duenos-inscription.—A. Wilhelm discusses the Hecatompodon inscription and one pertaining to the Eleusinian Mysteries.—Chr. Huelsen identifies the Aemilius Probus, who gave Theodosius II the extracts from Nepos' work de historicis latinis, with one whose name is inscribed on three fragments of stone from the Colosseum.—C. Robert changes Arist. Birds 1701 to καὶ φίλιπποι Γοργίου.

Fascicle 2.

Paralipomena zu Euklid (Fortsetzung) (J. L. Heiberg). See Hermes XXXVIII pp. 46–74.

Die enoplischen Strophen Pindars (O. Schroeder). S. transfers the dactylo-epitritic odes of Pindar and four of Bacchylides into the Ionic rhythm known as *ἐνόπλιος*, in which the fundamental constituents are — — ∪ ∪, — ∪ ∪ — and — ∪ ∪ —, ∪ ∪ —. A lengthy introduction discusses the nature and origin of this metre, its occurrences in the Lyric poets and its close relation to and confusion with logaoedics. The fundamental peculiarity of Ionics is their three-fold character, producing a waltz-like movement. There is no antithesis between ascending and descending rhythms; but an equal balance is maintained by means of a medial stress (≡ ∪ ∪ ∪, ∪ ∪ ∪ ≡). The first and last syllable being common produces variety, now a retarded movement (— — ∪ — and — ∪ — —), now iambs and trochees, which are, however, peculiar to the rhythm. The Ionic measure, at once rigid and pliable, was highly developed before it combined with the choriamb to form the *ἐνόπλιος*, in which the choriamb with medial stress (— ∪ ∪ —) is of secondary value, just as the dactyl is in anapaestic verse, yet important in causing the rhythm of the verse to glide and soar rather than to rise and fall. The

letters a e i o u representing the five fundamental forms, with a few diacritics, serve to set forth compactly the metrical schemes and facilitate their description.

Eine Prosaquelle Vergils und ihre Umsetzung in Poesie durch den Dichter (P. Jahn). This study attempts to show by means of parallel columns, that one half of Georgics II is a poetical version of a prose extract from Theophrastus' *περί φυτῶν ἱστορίας*. The agreements, taken in sections, follow frequently in the same order and are often nearly literal. This illustrates the remark of Columella that Vergil's method was *exornare floribus poeticis*.

Ἐλαφόστικτος (P. Wolters). Dittenberger showed (Hermes XXXVII p. 298) this to be a nickname of one marked with the figure of a deer to designate the runaway slave (*στιγματίας*). We have evidence that the owl, horse and ivy-leaf were used to indicate respectively the proprietorship of Athens, Syracuse and the god Dionysus; but the figure of a deer does not appear suitable. On a vase of the Munich collection appear two women whose arms and legs are tattooed showing at least one figure of a deer. These vasepaintings probably represent Thracians, whose custom of tattooing is well known as it is of other races in antiquity. We may presume then that the Ἐλαφόστικτος of Lysias (13, 19) was tattooed with one or more such figures, which would be considered an ornament in his native country, but in Athens marked him as a barbarian.

Zu Herons Automatentheater (W. Schmidt). S. tries to meet the criticisms of A. Olivieri, who argues (Rivista di filologia XXIX (1901) 424-435) that the above mechanism would not work according to Heron's description. S. while believing in its completeness refers the final solution to a practical test.

Zwei Listen chirurgischer Instrumente (H. Schoene). S. compares a Latinized list of 67 names of surgical instruments found in a IX century MS (codex Parisinus latinus 11219) with a similar independent list in Greek characters of the XI century (Laurentianus gr. LXXIV 2), containing 88 names, and so attempts to determine the original forms. It remains for a specialist to identify these names with the numerous surgical instruments discovered at Pompeii and elsewhere. The above lists yield a total of 104 distinct names.

Über die Handschriften der Silven des Statius (A. Engelmann). E. meets the objections made by Vollmer (see above), and gives reasons for believing that the Matritensis is a copy of a XV century MS. Line 86* (in M) is not genuine, hence the only proof of the priority of M over Poliziano's collation falls to the ground. This collation was complete, for the notes known as A were written in the same pale ink as notes A*, which were explicitly taken from the Poggio MS.

Zu Galens Schrift *Περὶ κράσεως καὶ δυνάμεως τῶν ἀπλῶν φαρμάκων* (M. Wellmann). The V century MS Constantinopolitanus (C) contains under the text of Dioscorides on the first few leaves corresponding sections from the illustrated herbarium of Crateuas and, more extensively, extracts from the above named work of Galen. This beautifully illuminated MS is valuable in showing what the oldest illustrated herbarium of the Greeks, the *ρίζοτομικόν* of Crateuas, was like; but the text of Galen, as of Dioscorides, has been arbitrarily abbreviated and changed so as to be valueless. The Galen extracts with critical notes follow to prove this assertion. Fuller and better extracts *κατὰ Γαληνόν* are found on the margin of a Dioscorides MS of the XV century (cod. Paris. gr. n. 2183). A few specimens of these are given to serve to identify the probably extant original.

Conjectanea (F. Leo). I Catulli versus 95, 7. 8; II Caelius Ciceroni (*ep.* VIII 3); III Horatii *carm.* I 20; IV Petroni *cap.* 82; V Valeri Flacci *Medea* VIII 6; VI Octaviae v. 485; VII CIL. VI 4, 33674.

Miscellen.—W. Dittenberger with the aid of an inscription conjectures *Χαρίων*, a rhetorician, for *Χαβρίων*, the general, in Plutarch's *An virtus doceri possit* (3 p. 440 b.).—J. Schoene shows that Photius' extracts from Plutarch's lives were arranged chronologically.—The same scholar finds that Cicero *ad fam.* V 5 contains a rough draft of the letter followed by a smoother copy, the latter beginning with "Meus in te animus" (cf. A. J. P. XIX p. 227).—M. Manitius presents his collation of the legible part of the Dresden MS R. 52^r (XII century) containing Cicero's *orat. Phil.*—Joseph Mesk proposes *παράλιον* or *πάραλον* for *Παραίτιον* in Xenophon of Ephesus III 12, 1 (cf. E. Rohde *Gr. Roman* (2. Aufl.) p. 422 A. 4).—F. Hiller von Gaertringen cites a list of five *πρυτάνεις* found in Alexandria, but recognized as Rhodian by v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff. (See Miscellen above.)

HERMAN L. EBELING.

BRIEF MENTION.

There is worse reading than the *Opuscula* of GOTTFRIED HERMANN, a mighty shade in the days when I began to learn my business, and in turning over the third volume the other day I chanced on two prefaces, one of which made a deep impression on my youthful mind more than fifty years ago. In the preface to his edition of the *Odyssey* as in the preface to his edition of the *Iliad* the fine old scholar emphasizes the importance of reading Homer continuously, and tells us how he read the *Iliad* over and over again within the compass of a few days. Years before I knew aught of Hermann except the name I had been stirred by the passage in Gibbon's autobiography in which he informs us that 'Scaliger ran through the *Iliad* in one and twenty days' and adds 'I was not dissatisfied with my diligence for performing the same labour in an equal number of weeks'. It was easy enough to beat Gibbon, but when it comes to Scaliger, when it comes to Hermann, the question 'How?' arises. To read Homer as Hermann read him, as Hermann would have us read him, with the eye now on this, now on that element, is not an easy matter for men of a certain temperament. One gets caught in the undertow, and I have once at least found myself turned back from ω to Λ and forced to begin all over again in order to verify an observation I thought I had made. Even lesser units are not often read continuously by the average scholar, such units as a major dialogue of Plato or a long speech of Demosthenes; and I myself remember as a manner of revelation the first time I read the *De Corona* through without leaving my chair from *πρῶτον μὲν, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι* to the musical close *σωτηρίαν ἀσφαλῆ*. It was some thirty years ago. I had studied the speech years before under the illustrious master Boeckh. I had gone through it *guttatim et stillatim* with undergraduate classes, but I never felt the thrill of it and the surge of it as I did then. What was intended to be heard at one sitting ought to be read at one sitting. But I am afraid that I forgot to mark some of the typographical blunders I had set out to correct in an edition of that date, much lauded by the only kind of press we had then, for I find on consulting the book that I had scored only some two hundred errors. The trouble is that after such hours of exaltation commentaries always seem to be more or less an impertinence. And yet commentaries are not an impertinence, nay, are eminently necessary, though, to quote the same old master, many commentaries are constructed on false principles, and one type was his abomination as it is mine:

Si de rebus alienis in commentariis scriptum est, non tam hi scriptoris caussa facti esse scriptor, ut commentarius scribi potuerit, editus videtur.

At all events there is no lack of commentaries on the De Corona and more are on the way. The latest next to GOODWIN's smaller edition is ROSENBERG's new revision of WESTERMANN's standard work (Weidmann), with which I made acquaintance in the year of its first issue. The Westermann edition of 1850 contains 144 pp., the Rosenberg-Westermann of 1903 contains 194 and the additional fifty pages hold much valuable matter, whereas enlarged editions often resemble nothing so much as blown up veal; and Blass was right when he prided himself on the reduction of the bulk of the first volume of his 'Attische Beredsamkeit' in its second edition. Indeed a comparative study of the different succeeding editions of the Haupt and Sauppe series would yield much food for reflection and throw much light on the progress of doctrine. The fad of one editor is thrust out by the fad of another and one is reminded of the shifting proportion of articles in cyclopaedias. Look at the space occupied by 'Magic Squares' in the first edition of Johnson's Cyclopaedia and the space occupied by the same subject in the second. Studied in this way commentaries would furnish much material for history, more perhaps for biography. But evidently 'Brief Mention' is not the place for a minute differentiation between WESTERMANN and ROSENBERG, between the 'Grundstock' and the 'Bearbeitung', which must not be translated 'belaboring', as one is sometimes tempted to do when the younger commentator revises his predecessor. So far as I have observed, ROSENBERG's attitude towards WESTERMANN is all that it should be, and there is no occasion to espouse the cause of Entellus against Dares.

ROSENBERG's laudable object is to bring the work up to date and to cover every point—political situation, grammatical phenomenon, rhetorical device, sophistic trick. Ay, sophistic trick, for in this edition at least, our admiration of the forked lightning of Demosthenean eloquence is not suffered to blind us to the cloven foot of the disingenuous pleader. Diligent use has been made of recent German contributions and due honor is paid to such Demosthenean scholars as Blass and Fox, but no mention is made of Goodwin's *magnum opus*, which has been received everywhere with loud acclaim, and that is all the more remarkable as in the Leptinea due credit is given to Sandys for his elaborate edition, so that the English garb could not have interfered with the recognition of Goodwin's merits. Piqued by this neglect, as a good American should be, I had hoped to

find time for a comparison which might have revealed how much ROSENBERG would have gained by the study of GOODWIN, but I must leave the vindication of American work to others. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that ROSENBERG sets forth a greater array of points than do his rival editors, and the important subject of rhythm is made justly conspicuous. Granted the danger of over-analysis here as elsewhere, still without some demonstration of the calculable effects of rhythm, the beginner will fail to appreciate the importance of this untranslatable element of Demosthenean style. Syntactical notes are easily overdone, and from my point of view the student who is ripe enough for Demosthenes might easily dispense with the trivialities of syntax such as Weil brushes aside (A. J. P. IV 529); and some of the syntactical notes in ROSENBERG seem superfluous, and others do not get to the heart of the matter, but everyone will be grateful for those helps that cannot be found ticketed in text-books. What is commonplace to one may be a revelation to another, and if each specialist were to strike out of every commentary what is stale or false to him, we should be badly off for commentaries, and so I suppress my syntactical jottings.

Mr. NAIRN tells us in the Preface to his *Herodas* (Oxford, Clarendon Press), that the preparation of an edition of Herodas first suggested itself to him on the occasion of the performance of one of the Mimes (Διδάσκαλος) in June, 1902, by some of the boys of Merchant Taylors' School, of which Mr. NAIRN is Headmaster. English boys accept more stoically than do American boys the Orbilius ideal of education and nothing could be more characteristically British than the selection of that brutal mime for public performances. But as we owe to this selection Mr. NAIRN's laudable effort to supply the lack of an adequate English commentary, we on this side will not quarrel with the occasion, and the literature of Herodas, as the editor prefers to call him, being much scattered, Mr. NAIRN has set himself a praiseworthy task in undertaking not only to garner the notes of the various editions but also to glean the Herondaean ears that have been dropped in monographs and in philological journals. Especial attention is naturally paid to what British scholars have done and Mr. NAIRN has endeavored to give to English critics their 'due share of credit', of which, by the way, English critics are unreasonably jealous (A. J. P. XXIII 348): and so eager is Mr. NAIRN in vindicating the rights of his countrymen that he claims for Mr. Henry Jackson the identification of the βαυβών with the ἄλιςβος (VI 19) though M. Henri Weil's article was published in 1891, and Mr. Jackson's in 1892. Perhaps it will never be known who first nosed out the unsavory secret, which Radermacher has stirred still further Rh. Mus. LIX 313. Soon

after the publication of the *Mimes* I saw the *mot d'énigme* in the *Hermes* XXVI (1891), p. 582, and inasmuch as the writer gives Bonn as the seat of his oracle, I had attributed the discovery to the famous editor of Petronius. But really the question of priority is not a matter of international importance like the discovery of Neptune, and we are not to bracket Weil-Jackson as we do Leverrier-Adams.

The conspectus of the more important literature is printed at the end of the introduction and occupies four pages of the eighty-seven. True, Reich's comprehensive work, 'Der Mimus,' appeared too late to be used, and I have before me a Freiburg dissertation by HERMANN KRAKERT on Herondas's use of the comic poets (Leipzig, 1902), which might have yielded more than the meagrenesses of the passages in Aristophanes cited in Mr. NAIRN's Introduction, but that treatise also may have been unavailable. But why Mr. NAIRN with his clamorous championship of English work on Herondas should have passed by Mr. Symonds' translations I cannot understand. Most of the Introduction is a frank compilation and to the scholar the most interesting thing about this edition will be the 'Evidence for the Text' because the editor has 'made the fullest possible use of the papyrus itself and' has 'been most generously assisted in deciphering it by Dr. Kenyon', so that he has 'been enabled in' his '*apparatus criticus* to correct several misstatements made by previous editors in regard to the readings of the MS.' What future editors will make of these corrections doth not yet appear. Mr. NAIRN's personal contributions to the restorations of the text are of the slightest and he himself has signaled I 82: οὐ π[αρα]λλάτ[τειν] as the most considerable.

The commentary is not the work of a man who has first steeped himself in the cognate literature. It is not such work as one expects of a Bücheler, of a Crusius (A. J. P. XIV 125). It has the happy-go-luckiness of so many editions, which condescend to bestow on the world just those things that happen to interest the editors themselves (A. J. P. XVII 518, XXIII 234). In my salad days I was surprised to find in a German commentary on Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* repeated citations of the Emperor Julian, *à propos* of what? The puzzle was resolved soon afterwards by the publication of Hertlein's Julian. And Pindar occurs with such frequency in Mr. NAIRN's commentary that as an old student of Pindar I look forward with interest to Mr. NAIRN's edition of his favorite and mine. Still, even at the risk of appearing pedantic, I must insist on the sphere. If a note on II 28: κακ ποίου πηλοῦ is needed, why cite Horace, C. I 16, 13 instead

of Pers. III 23 and Iuv. XIV 35, poets who belong to the Heron-daeian sphere. Simply stupendous is the suggestion (I, 5) that the corrector wrote Φιλαινίδος for Φιλαινίου, 'because he was puzzled by the neuter form in *ιον* of a woman's name.' No corrector could possibly have been ignorant of the familiar employment of these diminutives especially of the Φιλαινίς class. By the way, Philaenium figures in Plautus's *Asinaria* just as Gymnasium figures in the *Cistellaria*, Planesium in the *Curculio*, Erotium in the *Menaechmi*, to cite only those names that catch every eye as I cut the leaves of the welcome final volume of LINDSAY'S *Plautus*? On I 8, we are told that 'the *τι* in *στρέψον τι* is characteristic of Aristophanes'. About as characteristic of Aristophanes as 'a little' is characteristic of Shakespeare. 'Live a little, comfort a little, cheer thyself a little' says Orlando to Adam. I 25: *πέπωκεν ἐκ καινῆς*, the editor ought not to have admitted into his note the foolish suggestion that *ἐκ καινῆς* may also be adverbial, although he proceeds to reject it. The ellipsis *κύλικος* is not unlikely, but *πηγῆς* is not impossible especially when we consider the large use of 'well' and 'fountain' in erotic literature. Of *κεκαύχεται* I 33, he says that the perfect does not differ in sense from the present and to prove this he cites III 84, *ἔσχηκας* and IV 2: *ῥῆκηκας* which belong to another category of the perfect. *κεκαύχεται* is an emotional perfect. On I 41: *νηὺς μῆς ἐπ' ἀγκύρης* I miss the familiar passage from Epiktetos fr. 89 Sch. *οὔτε ναὺν ἐξ ἐνὸς ἀγκυρίου οὔτε βίον ἐκ μιᾶς ἐλπίδος ὀρμιστέον*. Epiktetos, if indeed the author be Epiktetos, belongs to the same homely sphere with Herondas. Much to my distaste are such notes as the one I 67: *τὰ λευκὰ τῶν τριχῶν*. 'This is somewhat more emphatic than *αἱ λευκαὶ τρίχες*.' Surely it is high time to give up such vaguenesses as more 'emphatic'. 'Emphasis', 'emphatic', like 'vividness' and 'vivid', are usually poor excuses for the explanation of an idiom. I 71: *χωλὰ ἀεῖδειν* is said after Crusius to mean 'liederliche Reden führen'. One craves further light, which falls from *ἄριστα χωλὸς οἰφεῖ*, a Greek proverb, Diogen. 2, 2, Athen. XIII, 568 E, which Byron quotes somewhere in his correspondence (A. J. P. VIII 511).

On II, 59, *Φασηλίδα*, cf. Dem. [XXXV] 1, to which I called Crusius' attention in A. J. P. XIV 125. It is a much more apt passage than Cic. Verr. 4, 10, 22, which NAIRN cites after Crusius. III, 18, we are bidden to 'note οὐδέν after *μή*'. 'We must', it seems, 'take οὐδέν closely with *καλόν*'. The passage runs: *κῆν μήκοι' αὐτὴν οἶον Ἀίδην βλέψας | γράψῃ μὲν οὐδέν καλόν, ἐκ δ' ὅλην ξύσῃ*. It is a μέν-δέ passage, and as in other μέν-δέ passages, the οὐ is due to the parenthesis. On III, 31: *ἀνώγωμεν*, it is passing strange that Mr. NAIRN should not have cited Pindar P. 6, 13 for the plural after a disjunctive. Such a concord is certainly less common than the use of a singular with a double subject which he thinks worthy of a note. On III 70 Mr. NAIRN finds Ribbeck's conjecture *πρὶν σχολὴ βῆξαι* 'before I have time to cough', 'attractive'.

True, there is an elliptical *πρὶν ὄρη* in Od. 15, 394, but a negative sentence precedes, and we are not to supply with *Monro* *ἔη*, for the present tense is un-Homeric, nor with *Hayman*, *ἔλθῃ* or *γένηται*. The notion is causal as in similar constructions with *ἔως* (A. J. P. XXIV 389). Hence the present indicative must be supplied, the only familiar ellipsis. On III 75: *ἐπαινέσειεν* we are told that *ἄν* is omitted. Read *κἄν περὶς* and the normal construction is restored. In V 75: *τίς οὐκ ἀπαντῶσα . . . ἐμπτύοι* the AN sound is there; and so these two precious specimens of 'Alexandrian Greek' disappear. See S. C. G. § 450, or A. J. P. XII 387. Doubtless bookish bards might omit *ἄν*, to show off, but in homely Greek like that of *Herondas*, the omission of *ἄν* is highly questionable. On IV 12 Mr. NAIRN says: 'It is clear from vv. 14 sqq. that the cock was sacrificed, not as being sacred to Asklepios, but as the poor man's gift', and a writer in the *Athenaeum*, Sept. 12, 1903, possibly Mr. NAIRN himself, tells us that the sacredness of the cock to Asklepios is a 'hoary superstition. Cocks were offered to every deity by those who could not afford a sheep or a bullock'. 'Every deity' is a sweeping statement. Nothing would seem more natural than the sacrifice of a pig to Aphrodite. Yet we are expressly cautioned against it. True, cocks were offered to other deities besides Asklepios, but there must have been a special propriety in offering a cock to the god of dreams, as we see from *Artemidoros*, V 9. The poor patient offered a cock, the rich patient a bullock, but that does not do away with the appropriateness of the lesser gift. On IV 22 we have a note on *ἐποίη* taken from the not inaccessible work of *Liddell* and *Scott*. On the next line there is a note on *Πρηξίτελειω παῖδες* taken from the much less accessible treatise of *Löwy*, *Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer*. Oddly enough in the same *Löwy* there is a much more exhaustive statistic of this artistic imperfect, which could hardly have been overlooked by a first-hand student (A. J. P. XXIII 251). On V 8 for the omission of *ἐστὶ* in the phrase *ποῦ μοι* might have been cited the familiar folk-song *ποῦ μοι τὰ ῥόδα*. By the way, V 15, *ἐγὼ μὲν*, gives actual warrant for the crasis in *Timotheos*, *Πέρσαι*, which I suggested for *ἐγὼ μοι* in a recent number of the *Journal* (XXIV 235). One ought never to take such things for granted, and I am not sorry that I was cautious, but still I take shame to myself for not remembering *Herondas* amid the barbarian's tumultuous Greek. In his note on VI 5 Mr. NAIRN seems to be under the spell of the 'hoary superstition' that there is something specially causative about the middle. It is a spell which his own countrymen have done their best to break. See *Riddell's Digest*, § 87. So too, of late, *Thompson's Meno*, p. 195. See also my note on *Pindar* O. 1, 98, and S. C. G., § 150. For the colour of the *φαλλῆς* it seems rather recondite to refer boys to *Suidas*. Why to anything? Or if to anything, why not to *Ar. Nub.* 538? On VI 20 Mr. NAIRN has a slighting mention of *Nossis*, which might

lead one to think that naught of Nossis was extant. True, the Lokrians are not in good repute (A. J. P. IX 458), but he might have said of Nossis that to judge by the epigrams attributed to her in the Anthology there is nothing to warrant her bad name. There is but one ἐρωτικόν among them all and that innocent enough (A. J. P. V 170). But I could fill pages with this kind of thing, and my excuse must be that the printer is calling for *Brief Mention*, and my steamer will not wait until I can find something worthier of note than these remarks, which hardly transcend the level of Mr. NAIRN's schoolboy actors of the Διδάσκαλος.

In my review of FUCHS's book on what I call the Temporal Sentences of Limit in Greek (A. J. P. XXIV 388-407), my chief concern was with the theory and not with the statistical detail. The theory of this class of sentences and the formulation of the actual usage I had worked out many years before, and FUCHS's treatise has added nothing of moment to syntax proper. In fact, important categories have been overlooked by him and his explanation of apparent abnormalities is often singularly defective, so that apart from the observations as to the varying sphere of the different particles—no secret to those who read Greek attentively—the whole mass of Fuchsian statistics cannot be said to have much significance. No wonder then that I did not undertake to verify FUCHS's figures and did not notice that he had given 14 μέχρι περ's in Plato's Laws, whereas Campbell gives 16. The difference between 14 and 16 vanishes in view of the bulk of the Laws. The main thing is the preference for μέχρι in the last stage of Plato's authorship. True, in discussing the more difficult passages, and in comparing my own collections with his, I soon found out the shortcomings of FUCHS's work, his false references, his omissions, his neglect of MS authority; and one of my correspondents, Professor BOCK, in a subsequent number of the Journal (XXV 109) has shown how negligent FUCHS has been in gathering his material. But long before the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY had called attention to FUCHS's lack of philological ἀκρίβεια, Professor FUHR had exposed his inaccuracies in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for April 18, 1903—a clipping from which greeted me on my return to America. Himself a statistician, who attracted my notice years ago by his suggestive article on τε-καί in the orators, Professor FUHR has not learned mercy from his own experience as I have from mine and by the help of indexes and by personal recount has convinced himself of the untrustworthiness of FUCHS's statistics. Somehow FUHR's review of FUCHS escaped my eyes, but if it had not, I should have used the treatise all the same. In a footnote of the article referred to (A. J. P. XXIV 392) I distinctly declined responsibility for his figures, which, as

I have said, happen to be of little moment for questions of genesis and growth in this particular class of sentences. At the same time every mistake in statistics is a demand that the work be done over again. All they that take statistics shall perish with statistics; and no one has protested more vigorously than I have against the misuse of figures in historical syntax.

Among the themes suggested for consideration at one of the congresses to be held at the St. Louis exposition was 'The Influence of Linguistic Studies on the Interpretation of Literature'. Unfortunately the subject did not fit into any of the established schemes. It did not belong either to philology or to literature, and, although a place was assigned to it, the unhappy man that signified his willingness to open the discussion, suddenly realizing the magnitude and the invidiousness of the task, followed the example of an earlier prophet and fled over seas. Doubtless, if he had carried out his original plan of comparing the chief histories of literature that have been published in the last hundred years, there might have been some interest, possibly some profit, in tracing the infiltration of the new ideas introduced by linguistic study. But such a review, to be anything more than a mere sketch or a mere skit, would have required a range of reading quite beyond the ordinary and a keenness of criticism that could have been gained only by long familiarity with the most varied linguistic and historical problems. The very conception was presumptuous and the abandonment of it is not to be regretted. For in all likelihood the whole thing would have resulted, if taken lightly, in a satire on modern tendencies; if taken seriously, in a reiteration of the old thesis that there is no line of linguistic study, no line of grammatical research, that may not be made directly or indirectly to subserve the end of aesthetic appreciation. The illustrations would have been drawn from the author's special domain and there would have been a flagrant defiance of the poet's wise warning: ταῦτ' ἀδὲ τρεῖς τετράκι τ' ἀμπολεῖν | ἀπορία τελέθει, τέκνοισιν ἄτε μαφυλάκας Διὸς Κόρινθος.

Still 'in magnis voluisse sat est', and it may be contended that the theme is well worth pursuing. Indeed, the bare statement of it may be worth more than the address, which, I understand, continued to figure on the programme after the project had been definitely abandoned. It was a familiar remark in my boyhood that the titles of Dr. Chalmers' sermons covered the ground of his discourses so completely that it was not necessary to read the sermons themselves. 'The expulsive power of a new affection'—a rather grandiloquent variant of 'clavus clavum

pellit'—summarizes all the great Scotch divine had to say on that subject, and the bare statement that the study of linguistics has profoundly affected the whole conception of literature even among those who are not addicted to linguistic research may serve to check the facile sneer of the *littérateur*. The florist may have his laugh at the botanist, such a happy laugh as breaks forth in Alphonse Karr's *Voyage autour de mon jardin*, but the botanist has his rights even in the ordering of a *parterre*.

One undeniable effect of linguistic study has been the widening of the term 'literature'. Comparative grammar owed its origin to the spirit of missions. The appreciation of the value of soul as soul led to the appreciation of language as language. To the student of linguistic science, nothing is common or unclean, and the ruder dialect, may be, nay, often is, more precious than the most refined idiom. In like manner the student of literature must not be satisfied with the definition of literature as 'written art', though I am free to confess that this is the definition that I myself have accepted, as one accepts so many definitions—not from a profound conviction of their ultimate truth, but from the necessity of getting forward. In fact, if one examines any modern history of literature and compares it with an earlier work on the same subject, the larger space given to the beginnings will show how the point of view has shifted. And yet formula is so apt to survive process that OUVRE in his remarkable work *Les formes littéraires de la pensée grecque*, published some four years ago, found it necessary to attack what I have just called the florist's conception of literature. According to him aesthetic charm is beside the question. All that we are to insist on is the conservation of verbal groups by a voluntary act of the individual or of society, and we must apply to literature the same rules that we apply to the study of the plastic arts. The dilettante does not admit to his collection 'vulgar objects or spoiled specimens' whereas OUVRE's limits 'embrace the chefs d'oeuvre of a Pindar, a Vergil, a Bossuet, newspapers, advertisements, shop signs'. It is, as I have said, a remarkable book, a barbed-wire trellis of metaphysical systematization, clothed with a tropical wealth of imagery. More than once have I attempted to treat the book as I have treated other books and to make a summary of it with a running commentary of my own. The theme interests me deeply. The title seems to cover much of my work. The sections follow the consecrated rubrics of epic, lyric, dramatic, history, philosophy, rhetoric under which I have registered my own observations,—rubrics which, to be sure, are hardly consistent with genetic theories. Indeed, when I first opened the book I thought that my occupation was gone. But language, which enters so largely into all my studies of literary form, OUVRE puts aside from the

beginning, so that I might have reinforced or haply supplemented his observations by the results of my own researches. However, repeated experiments have shown me that to do this adequately would require a volume, not a magazine article, and the book will continue to haunt me. Meantime the brilliant author has passed from among the ranks of living workers—and every one knows the peril to which the books of dead scholars are exposed. Every one knows how hard it is to keep a text-book alive when the author is dead, and OUVRE'S death may in like manner lead to the neglect of a work which is not very easy reading at any rate. And then, one would have liked to watch the effect of time on the man himself. The years might have sobered his genius. There might have been less barbed wire, less flaring flowers. Perhaps, I say, perhaps. For age does not always dull the appetite for spicy epigram or check the efflorescence of fancy. In fact, it is well known that some writers wax more figurative as they grow older. Only the figures are seldom organic. They are mere σχήματα not μορφαί. The number of beads and broken bits of glass multiply in the kaleidoscope of the brain. But the prism is unchanged, and the effects are too mechanical.

Honestly I cannot say that I think that an abridgment of OUVRE would answer for secondary schools. It would hardly do to translate 'Les oeuvres archaïques germèrent et fleurirent en des âmes où la vie confuse tremblait comme de la rosée chatoyante sur un taillis d'avril'; and even I should hesitate to begin an account of historiography by saying 'L'histoire est soeur du poème épique, une soeur cadette, mais plus grave, plus raisonneuse, moins charmante, comme le sont ordinairement les enfants, lorsqu'ils viennent sur le tard'. Then again, in adaptation for popular use the numberless allusions would fall away and with them much that gives piquancy to the treatment. An epic poem tells us that the siege of Troy was intended to relieve the earth overcome by the weight of the generations of men, another that the Sphinx was not a monster but a soothsayer clever at proposing insoluble questions. Whereupon OUVRE remarks: 'Ce malthusianisme céleste et cet évhémerisme avant la lettre n'ont pas beaucoup de portée'. 'Malthusianisme céleste' and évhémerisme avant la lettre are amusing expressions, but they would have to go. 'Des Acharniens au Plutus' he says (p. 289) 'les comédies déroulent une étoffe à paillettes qui scintille, mais se déchire sous les doigts'. I am not certain that even the context would make the justice of the comparison perfectly plain. Still I am of the opinion that was accidentally crystallized into a verse, 'tous les genres sont bons hors le genre ennuyeux', and in reading OUVRE one does not yawn, one does not sicken, one does not toss the book into a corner. He is not dry, he is not deliquescent, he is not frivolous, and that is saying a good deal.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 11 E. 17th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Abbott (Mather A.). A first Latin writer. New York, *American Book Co.* [1904 My5]. 145 pp. 12mo (Morris and Morgan's Lat. ser.), cl., 60 cts.

Aeschylus. The Agamemnon; tr. by Walter Headlam. New York, *Macmillan*, 1904. 61 pp. 12mo (Bell's classical translations), pap., 30 cts. net.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). Oration for Sextus Roscius Amerinus. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1904. 6+54 pp. 16mo (Students' series of Latin classics), pap., 30 cts.

Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris; ed. by W. Nickerson Bates. Text ed. New York, *American Book Co.* [1904 My12]. c. 55 pp. 12mo (Greek ser. for colleges and schools), pap., 30 cts.

Gildersleeve (Basil Lanneau) and Lodge (Gonzalez). Latin Composition. 2d ed. New York, *University Publishing Co.* [1904]. c. 4+197 pp. 12mo (Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin ser.), cl., 75 cts.

Justinian I. (Flavius Anicius Justinianus). The digest of Justinian. v. 1; tr. by C. H. Monro. New York, *Macmillan*, 1904. 36+399 pp. 8vo, cl., \$4. net.

Postgate (J. Percival). Corpus poetarum latinorum: a se aliisque denuo recognitorum et brevi lectionum varietate instructorum edidit Johannes Percival Postgate. New York, *Macmillan*, 1904. pts. 1-4. 4to, ea., pap., \$2.75 net.

Contents: Pt. 1, Ennius, ed. by Lucian Müller; Lucretius, ed. by J. P. Postgate, from the text of H. A. J. Munro; Catullus, ed. by J. P. Postgate; Virgil, ed. by Henry Nettleship; Horace, ed. by James Gow; Tibullus, ed. by Edward Hiller. Pt. 2, Propertius, ed. by J. P. Postgate; Ovid, ed. by Arthur Palmer, G. M. Edwards, G. A. Davies, S. G. Owen, A. E. Housman and J. P. Postgate. Pt. 3, Grattius, ed. by J. P. Postgate; Manilius, ed. by Malwin Bechert; Phaedrus, ed. by James Gow; Aetna, ed. by Robinson Ellis; Persius, ed. by W. C. Summers; Lucan, ed. by W. E. Heitland; Valerius Flaccus, ed. by J. B. Bury. Pt. 4, Calpurnius Siculus, ed. by Heinrich Schenkl; Columella x., ed. by J. P. Postgate; Silius Italicus, ed. by W. C. Summers; Statius, ed. by G. A. S. Wilkins, G. A. Davies and J. P. Postgate.

Seneca (Lucius Annæus). Seneca's morals. New York, *A. L. Burt Co.*, 1904. 394 pp. 12mo (Home lib.), cl., \$1.

Shipley (F. W.). Certain sources of corruption in Latin manuscripts: a study based upon two manuscripts of Livy; a thesis submitted to the faculty of the graduate schools of Arts and Literature of the University of Chicago for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. New York, *Macmillan*, 1904. 92 pp. 8vo, pap., 60 cts. net.

Thompson (J.). A Greek grammar: accidence and syntax for schools and colleges. New York, *Dutton*, 1904. 16mo, cl., \$1.50 net.

Virgil (Lat. Virgilius Maro, Publius). Aeneid; tr. by J. Conington. New York, *A. L. Burt Co.*, 1904. 462 pp. 12mo (Home lib.), cl., \$1.

ENGLISH.

Lane (T. O'N.). English-Irish Dictionary. London, 1904. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Wollaston (A. N.). Complete English-Persian Dictionary. Compiled from Original Sources. London, 1904. 4to. 3£ 3s.

de Silva Wickremasinghe (M.). Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. Epigraphia Zeylanica. Part I. London, 1904. 8vo. 5s.

FRENCH.

Bedjan (P.). Mois de Marie. (Texte syriaque.) Paris, 1904. 16mo. xv, 386 pp. 10 fr.

Sébillot (P.). Le Folk-Lore de France. Tome I. Paris, 1904. 8vo. 16 fr.

GERMAN.

Aeschinis quae feruntur epistolae, ed. Engelb. Drerup. (76 S.) 8. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1904. m. 2.40.

Böckel (Ernst). Hermann Köchly. Ein Bild seines Lebens u. seiner Persönlichkeit. (vii, 427 S., w. 1 portrait). 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter Verl.*, 1904. m. 10. Cloth, 11.

Bruckner (Wilh.). Der Helianddichter e. Laie. Progr. (36 S.) 8. Basel, 1904. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. m. 2.

Catulli Tibulli Propertii carmina a Maur. Hauptio recognita. Ed. VI., ab Ioh. Vahleno curata. (372 S.) 16mo, Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*, 1904. m. 2.80. Cloth, m. 4.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. VIII, supplementum pars III. Fol. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. Boards. III. Inscriptionum Mauretaniae latinarum, miliariorum et instrumenti domestici in provinciis africanis repertorum supplementum, ediderunt Iohs. Schmidt (†), Renatus Cagnat, Herm. Dessau. (S. 1905-2285.) 1904. m. 44.

— Vol. XIII, partis I, fasc. II. 40.5 X 29.5 cm. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. Boards. XIII, 1. Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et Germaniarum latinae. Ediderunt Otto Hirschfeld et Carol. Zangemeister. Partis 1, fasc. II. Inscriptiones Belgicae. (V, S. 39-64 u. 521-719.) 1904. m. 24.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses, Vol. XVI. Pars 2. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. 2. Turner (Eduardus). Quaestiones criticae in Platonis Lachetem. Sadée (Leop.) De Boeotiae titulum dialecto. (pp. 89-251.) 1904. m. 4.

Heinicke (Balduin). De Quintiliani Sexti Asclepiadis arte grammatica. Diss. (79 S.) 8. Strassburg, *Schlesier & Schweikhardt*, 1904. m. 1.60.

Herwerden (Prof. H. van). Appendix lexicis graeci suppletorii et dialectici, editi Lugd. Bat. a. 1902 ap. A. W. Sijthoff. (vi, 262 S.) 8. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*, 1904. m. 10.

Hubert (Curt.). De Plutarchi amatorio. Diss. (98 S.) 8. Kirchhainii, 1903. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock.* m. 2.

Nöldeke (Thdr.). Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. (ix, 139 S.) 8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1904. m. 8.

Noreen (Adf.). Altschwedisches Lesebuch m. Anmerkungen u. Glossar. 2. Ed. (vii, 184 S.) 8. Stockholm, 1904. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 4.80.

Plüss (Thdr.). Das Jambenbuch des Horaz im Lichte der eigenen u. unserer Zeit. (v, 141 S.) 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904. m. 4.

Polybii historiae. Editionem a Ludov. Dindorfio curatam retractavit et instrumentum criticum addidit Theod. Büttner-Wobst. Vol. IV et V. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* IV. (lvi, 552 S.) 1904. m. 5. Cloth. 5.60. V. Appendix. Indices et historiarum conspectum continens. (251 S.) 1904. m. 2.40. Cloth, m. 3.

Porta linguarum orientalium. Sammlung v. Lehrbüchern f. das Studium der oriental. Sprachen v. C. Brockelmann, R. Brünnow, Frdr. Delitzsch u. A. XIX. 8. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard.* XIX. Erman (Adf.). Ägyptische Chrestomathie. Zum Gebrauch auf Universitäten u. zum Selbststudium. (xxii, 156 S. 78 S.) 1904. m. 12.50. Cloth, 13.30.

— XX. Erman (Adf.). Aegyptisches Glossar. Die häufigeren Worte der ägypt. Sprache zusammengestellt. (viii, 160 S.) 1904. m. 13.

— IV. Socin's (A.) arabische Grammatik. Paradigmen, Literatur, Übungsstücke u. Glossar. 5. Ed. v. Karl Brockelmann. (xiv, 176 S. 156 S.) 1904. m. 7. Cloth, 7.80.

Pseudacronis scholia in Horatium vetustiora. Recensuit Otto Keller. Vol. II. Schol. in sermones, epistulas artemque poeticam. (xvi, 512 S.) 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904. m. 12. Cloth, m. 13.

Roediger (Max). Die Bedeutung des Suffixes ment. Diss. (vi, 128 S.) 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1904. m. 2.

Schaaß (Geo.). Syndetische u. asyndetische parataxe im gotischen. Diss. (99 S.) 8. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*, 1904. m. 2.40.

Schober (Ernest). De Apulei metamorphoseon compositione numerosa. Diss. (79 S.) 8. Halis, 1904. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock.* m. 1.50.

Schultz (W.). Das Farbenempfindungssystem der Hellenen. (vii, 227 S. Illustr.) 8. Leipzig, *J. A. Barth*, 1904. m. 10.

Studien, Leipziger semitistische. Hrsg. v. Aug. Fischer u. Heinr. Zimmer. I. Bd. 4. Heft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 4. Stumme (Prof. Dr. Hans). Maltesische Studien. Eine Sammlg. prosaischer u. poet. Texte in maltes. Sprache, nebst Erläutergn. (iv, 124 S.) 1904. m. 4.

— I. Bd. 5. Heft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 5. Stumme (Prof. Dr. Hans). Maltesische Märchen, Gedichte u. Rätsel in deutscher Übersetzung. (xvi, 102 S.) 1904. m. 3.50.

— I. Bd. 6. Heft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 6. Böllenrücher (Dr. Jos.) Gebete u. Hymnen an Nergal. (iii, 52 S.) 1904. m. 1.80.

Thesaurus linguae latinae. Editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinque germanicarum Berolinensis, Gottingensis, Lipsiensis, Monacensis, Vindobonensis. Index librorum, scriptorum, inscriptionum ex quibus exempla adferuntur. (109 S.) 4. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904. m. 7.20.

Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums. Hrsg. v. Geo. Steindorff. II. Bd. 1. Heft. 4. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 1. Urkunden, hieroglyphische, der griechisch-römischen Zeit. I. Bearb. v. Kurt Sethe. Historisch-biograph. Urkunden aus den Zeiten der makedon. Könige u. der beiden ersten Ptolemäer. 1904. m. 5.

— II. Bd. 2. Heft. 8. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 2. Urkunden, hieroglyphische, der griechisch-römischen Zeit. II. Bearb. v. Kurt Sethe. Historisch-biograph. Urkunden aus den Zeiten der Könige Ptolemäus Philadelphus u. Ptolemäus Euergetes I. 1904. m. 5.

Volumina aegyptiaca ordinis IV. grammaticorum pars I. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* I. Didymi de Demosthene commenta cum anonymi in Aristocrateam lexico post editionem Berolinensem recognoverunt H. Diels et W. Schubart. (viii, 56 S.) 1904. m. 1.20.

Welzhofer (Karl). Die Komposition der Staatsreden des Demosthenes. I. Die drei olynth. Reden. Progr. (56 S.) 8. Straubing, *H. Appel*, 1904. m. 2.

Wilpert (Osk.). Der Numerus des verbalen Prädikats bei den griechischen Prosaikern. Progr. (xi S.) 4. Oppeln, 1904. Gross-Strehlitz, *A. Wilpert.* m. 1.

Winckler (Hugo). Die Gesetze Hammurabis, in Umschrift u. Übersetzung hrsg. Dazu Einleitg., Wörter-, Eigennamen-Verzeichnis, die sog. sumer. Familiengesetze u. die Gesetztafel Brit. Mus. 82-7-14, 988. (xxxii, 116 S.) 8. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 1904. m. 5.60. Cloth, m. 6.20.

ITALIAN.

Cicerone (M. T.) I tre libri De natura Deorum, commentati da Carlo Giambelli. Libri II e III. Torino, 8vo, p. viii, 200. L. 2.50.

Luciano. Scritti scelti per cura del prof. Graziano Sinigaglia. Testo e commento. Firenze, 8vo, fig., p. xxiii, 269. L. 2.50.

Platone. Dialoghi tradotti da Ruggero Bonghi. Vol. XII. Ippia maggiore o Del Bello. Ippia minore o Della menzogna. Jone o Del furore poetico. Torino, 16mo, p. 132. L. 2.50.

Studi italiani di filologia classica. Vol. XI. Firenze, 8vo, p. 454. L. 20.

Tucidide. La guerra pel Peloponneso, per cura di Achille Cosattini. Commento al libro I. Firenze, 8vo, p. 139. L. 2.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aeschinis quae feruntur Epistolae. Ed. Engelbertus Drerup. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1904.

Bréal (Michel). Essai de sémantique. 3^e éd., revue, corrigée et augmentée. Paris, *Hachette et C^{ie}*, 1904.

Brown (Lester Dorman). A Study of the Case Construction of Words of Time. (Yale Thesis.) New Haven, Conn., *The Author*, 1904.

Cichorius (Conrad). Die römischen Denkmäler in der Dobrudscha. Ein Erklärungsversuch. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1904. 1 m.

Du Bellay (Joachim). La Deffence et illustration de la langue francoyse. Éd. critique par Henri Chamard. Paris, *Fontemoing*, 1904.

Eitrem (S.) Die Phaiakenepisode in der Odyssee. Videnskabs-Selskabets Skrifter. II. Historisk-filosofisk Klasse. 1904. No. 2. Christiania, *Jacob Dybwad*, 1904.

Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris. Ed. with an Introduction, Notes, and a Critical Appendix. By W. N. Bates. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1904.

Ferguson (W. S.) The oligarchical revolution at Athens of the year 103/2 B. C. Sonderabdruck aus: Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, herausg. v. C. F. Lehmann u. E. Kornemann. Bd. IV. Heft. 1. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1904.

Frank (Tenney). Attraction of Mood in Early Latin. (Chicago Diss.) *The University of Chicago*, 1904.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Leo u. Carl Robert. XXXIX Band. 2. Heft. Berlin, 1904.

Heyse (Max). Über die Abhängigkeit einiger jüngerer Aeschines-Handschriften. (Jahresb.) Bunzlau, 1904.

India, Linguistic Survey of. Compiled and edited by G. A. Grierson. Vol. V. Indo-Aryan Family. Part I. Specimens of the Bengal and Assamese Languages. Calcutta, *Government Printing Office*, 1903.

Jespersen (Otto). Lehrbuch der Phonetik. Autorisierte Übersetzung von Hermann Davidsen. Leipzig u. Berlin, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XXIV. Part 1. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1904.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. B. Gerth. Siebenter Jahrg. 1904. XIII. u. XIV. Bandes 4. u. 5. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1904.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Herausg. vom Neuphilologischen Verein in Helsingfors. N. 2. 3/4. 1904.

Pascal (Carlo). Dei e diavoli. Saggi sul paganesimo morente. Firenze, *Successori Le Monnier*, 1904. L. 3.

Pope (G. U.) A Handbook of the ordinary dialect of the Tamil Language. Seventh Ed. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1904.

Preud'homme (L.) Troisième étude sur l' Histoire du texte de Suétone De Vita Caesarum. Classification des Manuscrits. Bruxelles, 1904.

Radford (Robert S.) The Latin Monosyllables in their Relation to Accent and Quantity. A Study in the Verse of Terence. Extract from Transactions of the American Philological Association. Vol. XXIV. 1903.

Rasi (Pietro). Dell' arte metrica di Magno Felice Ennodio. Parte II: Metro eroico e lirico. Estratto dal Bollettino della Società Pavese di Storia Patria. Anno IV. Fasc. II. Giugno, 1904. Pavia, 1904.

Reich (Hermann). Der Mann mit dem Eselskopf. Ein Mimodrama vom klassischen Altertum verfolgt bis auf Shakespeare's Sommernachtstraum. Weimar, R. Wagner Sohn, 1904.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Bücheler u. H. Usener. N. F. LIX 2. Frankfurt, Sauerländer, 1904.

Vendryes (J.) Une loi d' accentuation grecque: L' opposition des genres. Extrait des Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris. Tome XIII.